

R E M A R K S
O N T H E
E N G L I S H L A N G U A G E,

In the Nature of

V A U G E L A S ' S R E M A R K S

O N T H E

F R E N C H ;

Being a Detection of many improper Expressi-
ons used in Conversation, and of many others
to be found in A U T H O R S .

To which is prefixed

A D I S C O U R S E

Addressed to

H I S M A J E S T Y .



L O N D O N , Printed for J. B E L L , in the
Strand. M D C C L X X .

Price *Two Shillings* few'd.

F R A T A

Discount to His Majesty, p. 2, l. 2, for a
 read an. p. 8, last line but one, for and read ex.
 p. 9, l. 18, dele after. p. 4, l. 1, for Land-
 scape, Animals, read Landscapes, Sea-pieces, Anti-
 mals. p. 20, l. 1, for Le Brun read Le Brun.

Dedication. After the Word Wet-Nurses, add
 not to mention the Golden Ball.

Preface. p. 2, l. 1, for Lessons read
 Lessons. p. 20, l. 1, for Importance read
 Importance.



Remarks. Page 2, l. 1, dele the short Be-
 rid that begins with Neither and ends with Lat-
 ter. p. 17, l. 4, for say read say. p. 24, last
 line, for is, read in. p. 80, l. 1, for Plural
 read Singular. Page 102, lines 15 and 22, for
 Trifle read Trifle. p. 106, l. 1, for Ibis, read
 Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope. p. 110,
 5th line from the bottom, for the year, read than
 the year. p. 112, l. 10, dele a not. p. 118,
 l. 9, for of copying, read of the employing.

LONDON: Printed for J. B. 1784.
 Price Two Shillings less 4d.

E R R A T A.

Discourse to His Majesty, p. 2, l. 2, for *a* read *an*. p. 8, last line but one, for *and* read *or*. p. 9, l. 18, dele *either*. p. 24, l. 1, for *Landscapes, Animals*, read *Landscapes, Sea-pieces, Animals*. p. 26, l. 1, for *Le Bran* read *Le Brun*.

Dedication. After the Word *Wet-Nurses*, add *not to mention Surgeons that live at the Golden Ball*.

Preface. Page 22, l. 28, for *Lacoon* read *Laocoon*. p. 26, l. 19, for *Anquaintance* read *Acquaintance*.

Remarks. Page 5, l. 1, dele the short Period that begins with *Neither* and ends with *Later*. P. 17, l. 4, for *say* read *says*. P. 24, last line, for *is*, read *in*. p. 86, l. 1, for *Plural* read *Singular*. Page. 102, lines 15 and 22, for *Triffle* read *Trifle*. p. 106, l. 1, for *Ibid.* read *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope*. p. 110, 5th line from the Bottom, for *the using*, read *than the using*. p. 112, l. 10, dele *a not*. p. 118, l. 9, for *of employing*, read *of the employing*.

P. R. A. T.

The first of the three parts of the
work is a general introduction to the
subject, and is intended to be read
by all who are interested in the
subject.

The second part is a description of the
various methods of the subject.

The third part is a description of the
various methods of the subject.

The fourth part is a description of the
various methods of the subject.

The fifth part is a description of the
various methods of the subject.

The sixth part is a description of the
various methods of the subject.

The seventh part is a description of the
various methods of the subject.

DEDICATION.

T O

His Grace the Duke of GRAFTON

A N D T H E

Right Honourable the

E A R L of L I T C H F I E L D.

Your GRACE and My LORD,

I Dedicate this Performance to *you* jointly, as Chancellors of our two Universities, and as consequently supposed Guardians and Promoters of Learning. A Work of this Kind, however necessary, has never yet appeared among us. If I have not succeeded, it seems to be your Duty to recommend a like Attempt to those who probably will do better. Such, without all Doubt, are to be found in *Oxford* and *Cambridge*. Herein you will do Service to the Cause of Literature, and shew yourselves more worthy of the Dignity that has been conferr'd on

A

you

DEDICATION.

you, than, I fear, some of our late Chancellors have been. Their Installations, and their Feasts upon other Occasions, have been to the Emolument of Inn-keepers and of Furnishers of Provisions, and (I suppose) of Physicians and Apothecaries; and sometimes perhaps, at the Expiration of nine Months, to that of a few Midwives and Wet-nurses. But I want to know how they have promoted Learning,

I am,

With all due Respect,

Your Grace's and

Your Lordship's

Obedient Servant,

The AUTHOR.

P R E F A C E. i.

IT seems to be a Matter of Wonder, considering how inclined we are to ape the French, that we have never yet had a Production of this Sort, they having several; the first, as well as the most considerable of which, viz. *The Remarks of Vaugelas*, made it's Appearance about a hundred and ten Years ago. I have not his Book by me: nor did I ever see more than one Copy of it; which Copy I had in my Possession for some Time: but, according to what I can recollect, though there are many interesting, and some very curious, Observations in him, some others are but trifling, as turning upon the spelling of a Word. I remember likewise that I thought him too much prejudiced in Favour of Expressions used at the French Court. That Courtiers, whose being continually in the Eye of their Prince induces them to study Elegance, have in general a more refined Taste than other Men I am willing to believe. But to prefer an Expression used at Court to another of the same Import used by all the Rest of the Nation, when the former is not intrinsically a better than the latter, but is perhaps a worse, is most certainly wrong. And yet this *Vaugelas* does throughout his Book.

Among others of the French, who have made Attempts of this Nature, is the learned *Menage*. But I don't find that his Countrymen hold his Performance in any great Estimation: For, though he was a Man of immense Erudition,

(beyond Comparison greater than that of *Vaugelas*) he had little or nothing of Genius, and but a poor and false Taste.

It may possibly be expected that, being the first Englishman who has undertaken a Work of this Sort, I should give some Account of myself, and let the Public know what Ground I have to think myself adequate to the Task.

Here I am apprehensive of suffering through Prejudice, the World having long entertained a Notion that no Man can be a Critic in his Mother-tongue, without being a Master of the Latin and Greek. Now I confess that I am entirely ignorant of the Greek, and but indifferently skilled in the Latin, where I can construe nothing but what is easy. I quitted the School at fifteen, and am one of that large Number, who, as I have observed in my Discourse to the King, having been injudiciously instructed, and not understanding the Latin well enough, at their leaving School, to read an Author with Pleasure, entirely neglect the Language from that Time, and come to lose a Part even of the imperfect Knowledge they once had of it.

But why should this incapacitate a Man for writing his Mother-tongue with Propriety? His not being well versed in the different Languages, from which it is derived, renders him indeed unfit to compose a Dictionary, as it unqualifies him for giving the Etymology of Words. But it by no Means renders him incapable of a Production of this Nature, provided his natural
Taste

Taste be sufficiently good, and he have a Knowledge of the Rules of Grammar and of the Idioms of the Tongue as it is spoken by his Countrymen in general, and an Acquaintance with the best Writers in it.

A Man, who is fond of reading, naturally makes an Acquaintance with the best Writers, unless his Taste be bad indeed; and he must be a great Dunce, that does not easily attain to the Knowledge of the Rules of Grammar. But whether my Taste be so good as is requisite for what I have undertaken, as also whether I am sufficiently acquainted with the Idioms of the Tongue, must be left to be decided by the Work itself. As, on the one hand, it would ill become *me* to affirm that I *have* these Qualifications, so, on the other, if by a nauseous Affectation of Modesty and Humility I should declare or intimate that I believe I have them *not*, the Question would naturally offer, *Why then have you given yourself this Trouble?*

Why indeed does any Man publish his Thoughts, if he believes himself unable to produce what may be worth the Attention of the Public? Without any mention therefore of what I suppose my Qualifications to be, I shall only say that I firmly believe these Observations are, in general, just: And, as I take many of them to be new, I flatter myself my Performance may be of some use. What Errors I have been guilty of I shall be glad to have pointed out to me: and wherever I am convinced of a Mistake,

take, I will not fail to recant, should my Book pass through a second Edition. But, though I were even *infallible*, it were to be wished we had Performances of this kind by different Hands. Every just Observation does not occur to any *one* Mind: and the Improprieties, that passed unnoticed in one of these Productions, the Reader might find detected in another. I could indeed myself easily have made double the number of Observations I here give the Public: but I chose to see first how these would be received, not being willing to throw away too much Labour.

It will be easily discovered that I have paid no Regard to Authority. I have censured even our best Penmen, where they have departed from what I conceive to be the Idiom of the Tongue, or where I have thought they violated Grammar without Necessity. To judge by the Rule of *Ipse dixit* is the Way to perpetuate Error. But don't let the Reader imagine me vain enough to suppose my own Style preferable upon the whole, or at all equal to that of some of the Writers, whom I have thus criticised.

Such as my Work is, it is entirely my own, and no other Person is necessary to whatever it contains liable to Censure. Not being acquainted with any Man of Letters, I have consulted Nobody.

It will undoubtedly be thought strange, when I declare that I have never yet seen the folio Edition of Mr. *Johnson's* Dictionary: but, knowing

ing Nobody that has it, I have never been able to borrow it, and I have myself no Books; at least, not many more than what a Church-going old Woman may be supposed to have of devotional Ones upon her Mantle-piece; for, having always had a narrow Income, it has not been in my Power to make a Collection, without straitening myself. Nor did I ever see even the Abridgment of this Dictionary till a few Days ago, when, observing it inserted in the Catalogue of a Circulating Library where I subscribe, I sent for it.

The Reader will perceive in the 104th Remark, that I take it for granted the *s*, which we use at the End of our Genitives, where they are not preceded by the Preposition *of*, is a Contraction of *his*: And I speak of the Barbarism there is in such Expressions as these—*That Woman's Estate*,—*Those Men's Properties*.—which I suppose to be Contractions of *that Woman his Estate*,—*those Men his Properties*.

I perceive by the Grammar Mr. Johnson has prefixed to this Abridgment, that he is of Opinion here is no Contraction; that *Woman's* is *one* Word only, and not *two*; and consequently that the Apostrophe was originally improper. His Argument hereupon staggers me, I own; but does not convince me.

“ These Genitives ” says he, “ are always
 “ written with a Mark of Elision, according to
 “ a long received Opinion that the *'s* is a Con-
 “ traction of *his*, as *The Soldier's Valour* for the
 “ Soldier

vi. P R E F A C E.

“Soldier his Valour.” But this cannot be the true Original, because *’s* is put to female Nouns, as *Woman’s Beauty*, *the Virgin’s Delicacy*, and collective Nouns, as *Women’s Passions*, *the Rabble’s Insolence*, *the Multitude’s Folly*. In all these Cases it is apparent that *his* cannot be understood.”

Here I am afraid Mr. Johnson pays the World an undeserved Compliment. I apprehend that, on the Contrary, nothing of this Nature can be too preposterous for Men to be guilty of. Let us consider an Expression or two in the French Tongue. *Il ne s’en est gueres falu* signifies *It wanted but little if it*. Yet these Words, if we attend to the Sense of each of them separately, have no Meaning. *Failli*, which is the Participle of *Faillir to be deficient*, was undoubtedly the Word originally used; whereas *Falu* is the Participle of *Faloir To behave*. Notwithstanding this, *salu* is here used by the whole French Nation, learned and ignorant. A *Failli* would sound uncouth; and a Man, to talk easy French, must talk Nonsense.

Again. *Au prix de* signifies *in Comparison with*. But, without all Doubt, *Aupres de*, literally *near to*, was the original Expression. For *near to*, to signify *in Comparison with*, is a natural way of speaking, a Comparison of two Objects being best made, when they are placed *near to* each other, or Side by Side; whereas *to the Price of*, and *at the Price of*, which are the literal Meanings of *au Prix de*, are Nothing at all to the Purpose. Yet is this Expression. of *au*
Prix

Prix de become by far the most common of the two; *aupres de*, in the Signification of *in Comparison with*, being almost confined to Oratory and Poetry.

The Reader may likewise see what I have taken Notice of in Remark 37.

From these and other Examples that might be brought, it is plain that the Absurdity of an Expression, as used in a certain Sense, is no Proof at all that it has not been, or may not be, universally received in that Sense.

But perhaps it may not be difficult to give a Reason why this using the Adjective *his* with female or with plural Nouns, tho' it may appear so very preposterous *now*, was *originally* not at all so. For we are to consider that Languages are not formed at once. We may reasonably suppose them to be at first little, if any Thing, better than the Sounds, which the most sagacious Brute Animals make to each other. It is by *Degrees* only that Distinctions are made: wherefore it appears highly probable that in the crude Infancy of *most*, if not of *all* the Languages that *are* or *have been*, the different Ideas, which we English express by the Words *he*, *she*, *it* and *they*, were expressed by one and the same Word. The French even at this Day, when their Language is become so copious and so refined, have no neuter Pronoun; and, to express the *it* of the English, they use either *il* or *elle*, which Words signify *he* & *she*. On the other Hand, they make a Distinction which we do not make: for we use

B

the

vi. P R E F A C E.

“Soldier his Valour.” But this cannot be the true Original, because *’s* is put to female Nouns, as *Woman’s Beauty*, *the Virgin’s Delicacy*, and collective Nouns, as *Women’s Passions*, *the Rabble’s Insolence*, *the Multitude’s Folly*. In all these Cases it is apparent that *his* cannot be understood.”

Here I am afraid Mr. Johnson pays the World an undeserved Compliment. I apprehend that, on the Contrary, nothing of this Nature can be too preposterous for Men to be guilty of. Let us consider an Expression or two in the French Tongue. *Il ne s’en est gueres falu* signifies *It wanted but little if it*. Yet these Words, if we attend to the Sense of each of them separately, have no Meaning. *Failli*, which is the Participle of *Faillir to be deficient*, was undoubtedly the Word originally used; whereas *Falu* is the Participle of *Faloir To behove*. Notwithstanding this, *salu* is here used by the whole French Nation, learned and ignorant. A *Failli* would sound uncouth; and a Man, to talk easy French, must talk Nonsense.

Again. *Au prix de* signifies *in Comparison with*. But, without all Doubt, *Aupres de*, literally *near to*, was the original Expression. For *near to*, to signify *in Comparison with*, is a natural way of speaking, a Comparison of two Objects being best made, when they are placed *near to* each other, or Side by Side; whereas *to the Price of*, and *at the Price of*, which are the literal Meanings of *au Prix de*, are Nothing at all to the Purpose. Yet is this Expression. of *au Prix*

Prix de become by far the most common of the two; *aupres de*, in the Signification of *in Comparison with*, being almost confined to Oratory and Poetry.

The Reader may likewise see what I have taken Notice of in Remark 37.

From these and other Examples that might be brought, it is plain that the Absurdity of an Expression, as used in a certain Sense, is no Proof at all that it has not been, or may not be, universally received in that Sense.

But perhaps it may not be difficult to give a Reason why this using the Adjective *his* with female or with plural Nouns, tho' it may appear so very preposterous *now*, was *originally* not at all so. For we are to consider that Languages are not formed at once. We may reasonably suppose them to be at first little, if any Thing, better than the Sounds, which the most sagacious Brute Animals make to each other. It is by *Degrees* only that Distinctions are made: wherefore it appears highly probable that in the crude Infancy of *most*, if not of *all* the Languages that *are* or *have been*, the different Ideas, which we English express by the Words *he*, *she*, *it* and *they*, were expressed by one and the same Word. The French even at this Day, when their Language is become so copious and so refined, have no neuter Pronoun; and, to express the *it* of the English, they use either *il* or *elle*, which Words signify *he* & *she*. On the other Hand, they make a Distinction which we do not make: for we use

vi. P R E F A C E.

“Soldier his Valour.” But this cannot be the true Original, because *’s* is put to female Nouns, as *Woman’s Beauty, the Virgin’s Delicacy*, and collective Nouns, as *Women’s Passions, the Rabble’s Insolence, the Multitude’s Folly*. In all these Cases it is apparent that *his* cannot be understood.”

Here I am afraid Mr. *Johnson* pays the World an undeserved Compliment. I apprehend that, on the Contrary, nothing of this Nature can be too preposterous for Men to be guilty of. Let us consider an Expression or two in the French Tongue. *Il ne s’en est gueres falu* signifies *It wanted but little if it*. Yet these Words, if we attend to the Sense of each of them separately, have no Meaning. *Failli*, which is the Participle of *Faillir to be deficient*, was undoubtedly the Word originally used; whereas *Falu* is the Participle of *Faloir To behove*. Notwithstanding this, *salu* is here used by the whole French Nation, learned and ignorant. *Failli* would sound uncouth; and a Man, to talk easy French, must talk Nonsense.

Again. *Au prix de* signifies *in Comparison with*. But, without all Doubt, *Aupres de*, literally *near to*, was the original Expression. For *near to*, to signify *in Comparison with*, is a natural way of speaking, a Comparison of two Objects being best made, when they are placed *near to* each other, or Side by Side; whereas *to the Price of*, and *at the Price of*, which are the literal Meanings of *au Prix de*, are Nothing at all to the Purpose. Yet is this Expression of *au Prix*

Prix de become by far the most common of the two; *aupres de*, in the Signification of *in Comparison with*, being almost confined to Oratory and Poetry.

The Reader may likewise see what I have taken Notice of in Remark 37.

From these and other Examples that might be brought, it is plain that the Absurdity of an Expression, as used in a certain Sense, is no Proof at all that it has not been, or may not be, universally received in that Sense.

But perhaps it may not be difficult to give a Reason why this using the Adjective *his* with female or with plural Nouns, tho' it may appear so very preposterous *now*, was *originally* not at all so. For we are to consider that Languages are not formed at once. We may reasonably suppose them to be at first little, if any Thing, better than the Sounds, which the most sagacious Brute Animals make to each other. It is by *Degrees* only that Distinctions are made: wherefore it appears highly probable that in the crude Infancy of *most*, if not of *all* the Languages that *are* or *have been*, the different Ideas, which we English express by the Words *he*, *she*, *it* and *they*, were expressed by one and the same Word. The French even at this Day, when their Language is become so copious and so refined, have no neuter Pronoun; and, to express the *it* of the English, they use either *il* or *elle*, which Words signify *he* & *she*. On the other Hand, they make a Distinction which we do not make: for we use

B

the

viii. P R E F A C E.

the Word *they* both for the *ils* and for the *elles* of the French, making it masculine and feminine, as well as neuter.

Now, if our Ancestors, in the Infancy of the Language, had but one Word for the Substantives *he*, *she* and *they*, it follows almost of Course that they had likewise but one for the Adjectives *his*, *her*, and *their*. Consequently, if they had the Sort of Expression we now use, and, instead of saying *the House of the Man*, said *the Man's House*, as a Contraction of *the Man his House*, there was no Impropriety in saying *the Woman's House* and *the Men's Houses*, as Contractions of *the Woman his House* and *the Men his Houses*: and we may suppose that afterwards, when the Words *her* and *their* were invented, the *r*, the last Letter of these two Words, being less pliant and ductile, and not joining so kindly with the Ends of Words in general as does the *s*, this last Letter continued still to be used where it was now become improper.

I am not unapprized that, in Answer hereto, I may be told that I seem to beg a Question, and that I go upon the Supposition that our Ancestors did really use this Way of speaking, *that Man his House*, for *the House of that Man*; “which Supposition,” it will be added, “is
“unreasonable, such a Way of speaking being
“ungrammatical and unnatural. No Conclusion
“can therefore be drawn from thence in
“Favour of any Propriety there once may have
“been in placing the Adjective *his* after fe-
“male

“ male, collective, or plural Nouns.” But to this I should reply that, though such a Way of speaking be ungrammatical, and may therefore to *Grammarians* appear at *first View* unnatural, it is a *natural*, a very natural Way of speaking among an ignorant People, whose Language is not yet brought into any Form, and who may be supposed to express their Thoughts to each other much in the Manner in which we talk to Babies : and it is not to be imagined that, in improving the English Language, our later Ancestors, the more immediate Descendants of our remote Forefathers, have banished all the rude Idioms it contained.

The French to this Day have a Way of speaking, which is something similar. Instead of saying *Is your Father at Home? Is that Affair ended?* they say *Your Father, is he at Home? That Affair, is it ended?* where *Father* and *Affair* are Nominatives without any Verb. Nay, we ourselves likewise, where we would speak with an Emphasis and be particularly intelligible, often use Expressions of the same Turn. A Counsellor in pleading, instead of *That Man did so and so*, would not scruple to say, *That Man he did so and so*, and, in questioning a Witness, instead of *Is the Prisoner at the Bar the very Man?* *The Prisoner at the Bar, is he the very Man?*

Mr. Johnson proceeds thus. “ We say likewise *the Foundation’s Strength, the Diamond’s Lustre, the Winter’s Severity*. But in these Ca-

x. P R E F A C E.

“ ses *his* may be understood, *he* and *his* having
 “ been formerly applied to Neuters, in the
 “ Place now supplied by *it* and *it's*.

This seems to favour my above Conjecture that *he* and *his* were originally applied likewise to Females : of which if we have no Example in any of the Writings of our Ancestors, the Reason may be that the Word *she* was invented long before *it*, and at a Time too remote for any of their then Writings to have come down to us. What makes it highly probable that, supposing the Word *he* to have been originally masculine, feminine and neuter, *she* is the senior of *it*, is that, there being a far greater Likeness between Males and Females, who are capable of the same Actions and liable to the same Accidents with each other, than between Males and Neuters, the Word *he* was much more frequently misunderstood, when spoken of a Male or of a Female, than when spoken of any Neuter Object; and consequently a feminine Pronoun became so much the more necessary.

So far then, in my Apprehension, there seems to be no Ground to believe or to suspect that this *s* is not a Contraction of the Word *his*. But Mr *Johnson* adds as follows.

“ This Termination of the Noun seems to
 “ constitute a real Genitive indicating Possession. It is derived to us from those who
 “ declined *a Smith* of *a*
 “ *Smith* *Smiths*; and so in two other of
 “ their seven Declensions.

Here

Here is indeed, to all Appearance, an Objection to the common Opinion; but how far it militates I cannot judge, knowing nothing of the Language, from whence the three Words are taken, which, in the Passage just quoted, are inserted where I have left blank Spaces. Nor do I know *all* the *Letters*, nor even what the Language is. But I suppose it to be the Saxon. I perceive, however, that the plural Number and the Genitive of the Singular end with the same Letter, which I suppose to be an *s*. This, as I said before, *staggers*, if it does not absolutely *convince* me. But then I should be glad to know whether that Language has the Word *his* in the same Signification that it bears in our's, or any other Monosyllable ending with an *s*, and that has no other Consonant. If so, the *s* at the End of the Genitive in some of the Declensions of that Language, may not improbably be a Contraction of such Word, and therefore we have still the same Reason as before to consider that Letter at the End of the English Genitive as a Contraction of *his*.

Mr *Johnson* adds "It is a further Confirmation of this Opinion, that in the old Poets
 " both the Genitive and the Plural were longer
 " by a Syllable than the original Word. *Knitis*
 " for *Knight's* in *Chaucer*, *Leavis* for *Leaves* in
 " *Spencer*."

If Plurals and Genitives thus lengthened are to be found only in Poets, this Argument does not seem to be of any great Weight, considering
 the

the Liberties Poets are apt to take either to soften or to animate their Stile.

Upon the Whole, I know not well what to think of the Matter, but am rather inclined to take it still in the Light that I have hitherto done. Nor do I see why the Notion that a certain Letter, often occurring at the End of Words, is a Contraction of another Word, should become so universal, if it was not really so.

I shall only add that it is some Mortification to me not to be entirely of the same Opinion with Mr *Johnson*, whom I suppose to be a Man of as good Sense as any in the Kingdom, and whose Abilities I honour.

In the beginning of the Discourse to His Majesty, I have said that our Writers abound with Incorrectnesses and Barbarisms; for which I there suppose the Establishment of an Academy of *Belles Lettres* might in a great Measure be a Cure. I make no Doubt that the Academy of *Paris* has contributed not a little to the refining the French Tongue, there being an amazing Difference between the French of a hundred and ten Years ago and that of forty Years before. The former is quite modern, the other an antiquated Language. It was (I think) about the Year 1633 that Academy was instituted. The Members of it have not been however quite so active as they ought in their Endeavours to abolish barbarous Expressions. Can we suppose that, if all who have ever belonged to that Academy had constantly,
both

both in speaking and in writing, rejected the absurd Phrases of *est gueres falu* and *au Prix de* mentioned above, and persisted in pronouncing and writing *failli* and *aupres de*, can we suppose, I say, especially so many of these Academicians being celebrated Authors, that these last Expressions would not long before now have become universal? One Man alone, who opposes a whole Nation, by persisting in what is in itself ever so right, for the most part makes himself ridiculous. But such a respectable Body as this would have a great Weight. The Members would keep one another in Countenance; and the World, conscious of their having Reason on their Side, and being at the same Time awed by their Authority, would not fail to concur with them and to follow their Example. Who can imagine that the Latin-tongue would have so degenerated as it did between the Time of *Cicero* and that of *Seneca*, had there been in *Rome* a numerous Society of Men of Parts and Learning, who had set themselves as a Barrier against the Admission of unnatural or ill-sounding Expressions, and had endeavoured not only to maintain but even to improve the Purity and Elegance of Stile of the *Augustan Age*?

If therefore an Academy of *Belles Lettres* should ever be formed in *London*, it were to be wished that the Members, among whom we must suppose will of Course be the finest Writers of the Age, would, whenever they concur in Opinion that an anomalous Expression has nothing

thing of that unaccountable Pleasingness which irregular Phrases sometimes have, but, on the contrary, an awkward Absurdity that will always stare us in the Face, that they would, I say, come to a Resolution among themselves never to make use of such Expression. Should the Language at the same Time seem to want a more elegant One to convey the Sentiment, who so fit for the inventing it as these People, a Part of whose very *Trade* is Elegance and Propriety of Diction? The Rest of the Nation, according to what I said before, would not fail to follow them, sooner or later, in their Use of the one and Disuse of the other.

This and the inventing single Words of a pleasing Sound to express Ideas, for which we have no elegant Phrases, seem to be the most that can be done for the improving an old and settled Language: for, as to the new-moulding it and altering its general Form, it is a Thing impossible.

Should a certain Number of Gentlemen of our two Universities be admitted Members of this Academy, which, as I have said in my Discourse to the King, seems to be no more than what Good-Manners would require, they might be little less useful than if they resided *here*, a Correspondence being so easily kept up between *them* and the Members living in *London*. They might presently give their several Opinions upon any Thing started here, and, in their Turn, communicate whatever had been first suggested among themselves.

Were

Were such an Academy really subsisting, and (what has been often talked of) a new Theatre erected in *London*, it would be a Satisfaction, as I apprehend, to all Persons of Taste to have that Theatre in some Degree under the Direction of the Members of this Academy. If Players were obliged to hearken to the Admonitions of Men so judicious as we are to suppose most of these Members would be, they would not run riot and be guilty of the strange Absurdities they often are. I have given in my Remarks an Instance or two of the gross Ignorance of some of them in their making use of improper Words. These perhaps are not Actors of the highest Reputation. But even the most eminent among them, and such as the World is complaisant enough to call *first-rate Performers*, will sometimes turn all Sense topsy-turvy by an injudicious Delivery. *Othello* says to *Jago*,

'Tis yet to know (which, when I know that boasting is an Honour, I shall promulgate) I fetch my Life and Being from Men of Royal Siege.

Can any Thing be more intelligible than this? One would imagine every Person, not destitute of Understanding, must see at first Sight that these Words, placed in their natural Order and without any Attempt at a Pomp of Diction, stand thus, *'Tis yet to know I fetch my Life and Being from Men of royal Siege; which I shall promulgate, when I know that boasting is an Honour.* And yet the just and judicious *Quin*, as he was

often called, for many Years before his Retreat, pronounced this as though the Words *I shall promulgate* were not included in the Parenthesis, but belonged to *I fetch my Life and Being*. For Instance,

'Tis yet to know, (which, when I know that *boasting is an Honour*) *I shall promulgate I fetch my Life and being from Men of Royal Siege*: which is as much as to say, 'Tis yet to know *I shall promulgate that I fetch my Life and Being from Men of Royal Siege*: which, when I know that *boasting is an Honour*, and is as complete Nonsense as it is possible to utter.

Lady Brute, after some Altercation with her Husband, says to him, *What is the Reason that you use me as you do of late? It once was otherwise. You married me for Love*. Mrs Pritchard used, in pronouncing these last Words, to lay the Emphases upon *me* and *Love*—*you married ME for LOVE*,—Herein she quite altered Lady Brute's Sense. She should have laid them upon *married* and *Love*. By her laying an Emphasis upon *ME*, she seem'd to make a Comparison between his Motive for marrying *her* and his Motive for marrying *some former Wife*; which is wrong. Lady Brute ought to pronounce these Words in a Manner that expresses the Difference between his *now* Treatment of her, and his Treatment of her *at the Time he married her*. Sir John indeed in his Reply ought to put an Emphasis upon *me*. He makes Answer *And you me for Money*. Here ought to be three Emphases, one upon *you*, a-
nother

nother upon *me*, and the third upon *Money*: for *his* YOU stands opposed to *her* YOU, *his* ME to *her* ME, and *his* MONEY to *her* LOVE.

In the Play of *Measure for Measure*, *Angelo*, Vice-gerent of the Duke of *Vienna*, during the feigned Absence of this Duke, imprisons *Claudio*, a young Gentleman, and threatens him with Death; but signifies to *Isabella*, Sister of *Claudio*, that, if she will yield herself up to his Embraces, he will give her Brother both his Life & Liberty. *Isabella*, expressing to *Claudio* her Indignation at this Proposal, says

Oh, were it but my Life, I'd throw it down for your Deliverance as frankly as a Pin.

Mrs. *Cibber*, in pronouncing this, always laid a strong Emphasis upon *my*, and sunk her Voice upon *Life*; by which she destroyed the Sense of what she said. The Emphasis ought to be laid not upon *my*, but upon *Life*: for the Meaning is *I would most willingly give my LIFE to save you, but can't consent to give up my HONOUR.*

Now, if *admired* Actors are capable of misapprehending Passages so very plain and intelligible, what Room for Censure must we suppose there is in the Performance of their Inferiors! And is it right to suffer these People thus to mangle the Drama? A Theatre should be considered in the Light of a public School. Nothing should be delivered there but with the utmost Propriety and Precision: and there ought to be appointed a certain Number of Men of

xviii. P R E F A C E.

approved Parts and Judgment, authorised to take Cognizance of the Errors of these Actors, and to oblige them to correct themselves. I am as sensible as any Man can be of the real Merit of *Garrick*. His Talents both for Comedy and Tragedy are amazing.—In many Scenes of the latter he is even transporting. But to admire the whole of his Performance is to be stark blind. Among other Circumstances, the Stage would have no little Obligation to him for having banished the stiff Manner, in which Prologues were formerly delivered, if what he has introduced in the Room of it were not likewise censurable. His acting the Sense of every Word has certainly, as *The: Cibber* has already observed, too much of the Pantomime, and is very unnatural in every Character but that of a Buffoon. But it is no uncommon Thing for People to become unnatural by over-acting Nature. Gesture ought to assist and support Speech, but not to bear an equal Part with it.

How often, and yet to how little Purpose, has *Garrick* been reproved for making a full Stop in the middle and at the End of Lines in Tragedy, whether there be any Stop in the Sense or not: by which he so frequently makes Nonsense of what he utters!

I could never admire him, as many People have always done, in *Ranger* and *Benedic*. By a too great Desire of appearing natural and easy, he throws a lowness into both these Characters; and he makes the former, which in itself is a
very

very insignificant one, quite nauseous and contemptible.

In *Archer* he is in some Measure guilty of the same Fault : and he does not make this Character by far so elegant a one as the Poet intended it. In some of the Scenes too he plays the Buffoon. He seems to make a Jest of *Aimwell* in his Manner of lighting him to his Chamber : which Circumstance might be sufficient to give an Innkeeper (for *Boniface* is present) a suspicion that they are not really Master and Servant. Where he breaks in upon Lady *Bountiful*, Mrs *Sullen* and *Dorinda*, and informs them of his Master's sudden Illness, instead of behaving so as to make the old Lady believe the Illness real, which it is his Business to do, he plays the antic in such a Manner that she must be an old Woman indeed not to suspect it feigned.

In the Part of *Bayes*, in which he so highly delights the Shilling-Gallery, he is too much the Merry Andrew, and exhibits little or nothing of the delicate Absurdity of the Character, excepting in the first Scene, which he does admirably well.

An Actor often wrongly concludes, from his having made an Audience laugh, that he has given that Audience Pleasure. Ignorant People (and of such consists the Bulk of all large Assemblies not composed of selected Persons) will frequently laugh where they see preposterous Actions or hear preposterous Thoughts, though they feel no Pleasure at all : but, perceiving there is

Jest intended, and not knowing but there may really be a Jest in the Case, they laugh for fear of having their Understanding called in Question. I am convinced that *Garrick* would please more, *much* more, than he now does, if he made the Character of *Archer* more elegant, and did not play the Buffoon in any one Scene, though perhaps Nobody would laugh, or, to speak more properly, Nobody would *affect* to laugh. Let any Man of Sense read *The Stratagem*, and he will find Nothing to laugh at in what comes from *Archer*, though the whole of what he says excites cheerfulness, and not a few of his Speeches may raise a Smile. As to the Character of *Bayes*, it is what not every one is capable of entering into; and, if *The Rehearsal* were play'd in a just Manner, and not made a *Bartlemy-Fair* Entertainment, the Mob of the Audience would think it sad Stuff. This Comedy is spoilt, to all People of Taste, not only by *Bayes's* acting the Merry Andrew, but by the wrong Conception of those who perform the Parts of the Players. The Author intended these Players as Men of tolerable Understanding, and capable of seeing the Absurdity of *Bayes*: which Circumstance renders the Comedy so much the more entertaining: whereas the People, who play these Parts, seem to vie with *Bayes* in Blundering and wrong-headedness; and, together with *him*, they make such a Hotch-Potch of Nonsense that the true Humour of the Play is entirely destroyed.

I know not whether it was *Garrick* or *Mrs.*

Woffington,

Woffington, that was the Beginner of a strangely improper and very priggish Way of going off the Stage at the Conclusion of a Scene: but they were both early in it, and set a bad Example to the Rest of the Players, many of whom have been injudicious enough to imitate them. An Actor ought to maintain his theatrical Character till he is entirely out of Sight of the Audience. *Garrick* ought not to be *Garrick* till the Scenes hide him. Instead of this, Mrs *Woffington* and he took it into their Heads long ago, how serious soever the Part were that they were playing, to trip off the Stage with a bridled Head and an affected alertness. If one had a Mind to be ill-natured, one might suppose this was in order to give the Spectators an Idea of the Liveliness of their private Character. Mrs *Cibber* was sometimes guilty of the same Fault: but Mrs *Pritchard* never was.

'Tis now many Years ago that *Garrick* introduced among his Actors (for they are too implicit to suppose any Thing can be wrong which they see *him* do) another strange, and, in my Opinion, very uncouth Habit, viz. the raising the two Heels alternately, so as to have continually either the one or the other of the Feet resting upon its Forepart. I have some Suspicion that he was advised to this by some not-rightly-conceiving Painter or Sculptor. 'Tis true that to stand equally upon the two Legs is ungraceful. This is the Posture of old and of weakly People. Those, who are young and strong, seldom stand in that Manner, unless

xxii. P R E F A C E.

unless they are remarkably aukward. Where we thus rest chiefly upon one Leg, the Knee of the other Side of the Body becomes of Course a little bent: and, if we raise the Heel of that Side from off the Ground, it becomes still more bent. Now this waving Position of the Thigh, Leg and Foot, has its Beauty: and, at the same Time, the thus resting chiefly on one Leg causes something of that waving in the whole Person. It is not without Reason that *Hogarth* in his *Analysis* calls the somewhat-curving Line *the line of Beauty*: for strait Lines in the Shape of the Bodies of Animals and in their Attitudes are disagreeable. Accordingly, the antient Sculptors, whose Ideas of Beauty appear to have been so just, have taken Care to avoid these strait Lines. I cannot help thinking, however, that herein they have sometimes departed a little from Nature, and that, in contriving for their Figures this waving Attitude, they have here and there fallen into an Excess: Witness, among the rest, (I here speak to those only who have some Knowledge of the antique Statues) him of the two Brothers, *Castor* and *Pollux*, whose Hand is placed upon the other's Shoulder. Perhaps too the fine Figure of *Antinous* may be a little faulty in this Respect. As for that Master-piece, *Lacoon* and his two Sons, the extreme bodily Pain, they are supposed to be in, is a sufficient Plea for the Violence of their Contorsions. But, if the antient Sculptors have now and then made the Attitudes of their Figures somewhat more waving

waving, than Probability will warrant, modern Sculptors and Painters have been guilty of the same Fault in at least as great a Degree. As to the Habit of the *Drury-Lane* Actors mentioned above, and which I have said I suspect to have been at first owing to the Advice of some Painter or Sculptor, it is a very awkward One. To take Care not to stand equally upon the two Legs, unless it be in the Character of an old Man or Woman, is indeed right. But the raising the two Heels alternately, and resting for just so many Seconds chiefly upon one Leg, and then falling into the Counter-position for the same Space of Time, is stiff and unnatural, and has a disagreeable Air of Studiedness. There are many different Positions, in which the Legs may be placed; and here, as in all the rest of his Deportment, an Actor ought to avoid too much Sameness.

Before I conclude upon this Article, let me observe that, in standing, the Heel ought seldom to be raised, and never for any length of Time. To keep it so raised is unnatural, because to stand for any Time with one of the Legs bearing so great a Part of the Weight of the Body as it must then bear is very painful. It is further to be observed that the Foot, of which the Heel is thus raised, ought to be drawn back, and never to advance farther than, nor even equally with, the other Foot, these two Positions being unnatural and ungraceful. *Massop* was frequently guilty of this, and has often put

me in Mind of a Horse advancing one of his Fore-legs, and resting it lightly upon his Toe; which the poor animal does to relieve a tender Foot. When I say that the Heel ought never to continue raised for any length of Time, I mean, unless the Body be partly sustained by something upon which the Person leans: for in this Case the chiefly-supporting Leg bears so much the less Weight. There is a fine antique Statue of a Faun leaning, and playing upon a Flute, with one Foot thrown over the other and resting upon it's Forepart; which makes a very pleasing Posture, and gives the Figure a striking Air of Ease and naturalness.

Having taking the Liberty thus publicly to censure this celebrated Actor, whom upon the whole I very greatly admire, it seems but just that I should at the same Time publicly confess myself under an Obligation to him, he having, during the two Seasons immediately preceding the Time of his going abroad, granted me the Liberty of his House. He does not know me otherwise than by Name; but, being apprized that I was a great Lover of theatrical Entertainments, and suspecting, without Doubt, that I could ill afford Money for Pleasure, he caused it to be signified to me that I might send to him for Orders for any Part of the House as often as I pleased.

This Obligation was the chief Cause of my committing to the Flames, soon after, a great Number of Remarks, that I had been making
for

for four or five Years upon the several Performances of our Players; and which I had intended to digest and to publish. But I was more scrupulous then than I have shewn myself now, and was unwilling to criticise a Man to whom I stood indebted. I have heartily repented of it since: for either I flatter myself, or I should have made many Observations that would have been of some Use; a Thing, of which I am convinced the Author of the *Rosciad* was utterly incapable. This was a superficial Fellow, who, being puffed up by the injudicious Applauses of the Public, became at length the most insolent and insufferable of all Coxcombs. His Understanding was trifling: he had a small Share of Wit, and a middling Talent for Versification. What is to be thought of the Judgment of a Man, who makes a bare Mention of that excellent Comedian *Nates*, and that rather with an Appearance of Disesteem than otherwise, and is at the same Time an Admirer of the noisy, unmeaning *Blakes*? But this is not to be wondered at in a Critic, who, while he despises *Mason*, looks upon *Lloyd* as a Poet and a Genius; *Lloyd*, whose Works may not improperly be called *A chymical Extract of Insipidity*——the very Quintessence of *Nothingness*.

Had I ever reduced into Form and published these Remarks I have just mentioned, I should have been much more sparing of my Encomiums upon several admired Performers, among others, upon *Quin*, *Mrs. Cibber*, and *Mrs. Woffington*,
than

than the World in general has been. As to the last of these three, though she was undeniably capital in some very few Characters, particularly in *Lady Dainty* and *Clarissa* in *The Confederacy*, I looked upon her as one of the falsest and most unnatural Actresses I had ever seen.

HAVING gone from my principal Subject in this Preface, and rambled much, I shall continue to ramble on, and, as I have been always a lover of Pictures as well as of theatrical Entertainments, and have made the Theory of Painting in some Measure my Study, shall here set down my Opinion in general of about a Score of such of our modern Artists as I conceive to be among the best, after premising that I form my Notions of them from such of their Pictures only as have appeared in the Public Exhibitions, having never been at their Houses, and that I have no Acquaintance with any of them, nor even any Knowledge of their Characters otherwise than as Painters, and consequently may be supposed to speak without Prejudice. I shall mention them without any Order, and just as they occur to my Mind.

We have no English Painter now living, whose Productions are more perfect in their Kind than the Moonlight Sea-pieces of *Swaine* of *Stretton-Ground, Westminster*. I am sorry to observe, by his Pictures being all marked for Sale, that they are not in the Request they deserve to be: for he is a much better Painter than some,
whom

whom the Distributers of Prizes at the *Arts-and-Sciences* have brought into high Repute. This Man's Works will one Day or another be in Esteem, when that Esteem (alas!) will be of no Service to their Author.

Cotes is undoubtedly our best Painter in Crayons, and one of our best in Oil. In the Pictures of Children he succeeds better than Sir *Joshua Reynolds*. These Children of his have a striking and a most pleasing Nativeness.

Gainborough is one of our best Portrait-Painters.

One of our best Landscape-Painters is *Bond of Birmingham*. His Pictures are well coloured and very pleasing.

Our very best perhaps is *Marlow*. He has likewise a happy Talent for painting Buildings. But his Water, if I recollect right, has but little Truth, and is not transparent.

For Truth of Colouring we have hardly any Man that beats *Elmer of Farnham*. He seems likewise to be almost universal: the human Face, Fruit, dead Fish, Birds;—scarce any Thing comes amiss to him. At the same Time, he works, to all Appearance, with great Facility: Indeed, I fear too much in a Hurry; for his Pencil is harsh, though it is light and free. Neither has he much Idea either of Composition or of Clear-Obscure: and, though Nature has given him a great deal of Talent, he will never be a true Painter till he has more Patience to blend his Colours, till he places his Objects so as to please the

the Eye, and gives more Force and more Harmony to his Pictures by the Means of Light and Shadow.

The large Candle-light Piece exhibited some Years ago by *Wright* of *Derby*, where an Orrery was introduced, and for which one of our Noblemen was said to have given two Hundred Guineas, was but an indifferent Picture, whatever Encomiums were bestowed upon it. There was no great Truth in the colouring, and the Pencilling was somewhat heavy. The two Lamp-Lights, that he exhibited last Year, were much better. Perhaps he is improved since he painted the large Picture. Perhaps too he has more Talent for painting Figures of a moderate Size than for painting large ones. If so, he would do well to confine himself to those. Why should a Man be a bad Painter when he may be a good one?

After *Cotes*, our best Painter in Crayons, (and perhaps our only good one) is *Miss Read*. She likewise paints very well in Oil. Her Pencilling is free and easy, and her Colouring has a great deal of Truth. There is a Nativeness in her Children, as well as in *Cotes's*; but less of it; and herein she seems to be his Imitator.

Paul Sandby's Views are very good.

The View from the Gun-Wharf at *Portsmouth*, exhibited last Year by *Dominic Serres*, was an excellent Picture; and the English Man of War chasing a French Chebeck was little inferior, if any Thing.

Mrs.

Mrs. Kauffman has a very considerable Talent for History-Painting. Her Compositions are good: her Taste in Drawing the human Figure seems to be better than that of any other History-Painter we have; and she has a great Share of Expression. It would be happy if she could get rid of a certain Greyness of Colouring, which gives a Coldness to her Pictures.

I am apprehensive, from their Names, that the two Painters last mentioned are Foreigners. Were they Natives of *England*, they would do some Honour to our Nation.

We have some very tolerable Painters in Miniature: but the best in that Way, beyond all Comparison, is *Humphry*. He is indeed an admirable one.

I was in hopes some Years ago, from *Collet's* four Pictures of the Courting a young Lady, the Carrying her off, and the two Scenes after Marriage, that we were going to have an excellent Painter in the humorous Stile. Those Pieces, though but indifferently coloured, were very good in Regard to Invention, and admirable for the Justness of Expression in the Countenances. But the Hopes I then conceived are disappointed. He has since fallen into all the ridiculous Exaggerations and the false Humour of the worst Productions of *Hogarth*, to whom, from the four Pieces just mentioned, I expected to see him greatly superior. His *Teaching grown People to dance*, his *Master kissing the Servant-Maid*, and others of the like Kind, are contemptible. Ugliness

finest is false Humour, and excessive Exaggeration is the poor Refuge of those who want Skill to represent Things with Propriety and Justness. Let me advise this Painter therefore to throw off this absurd Habit into which he is fallen, and, at the same Time, to soften his Pencil, and to endeavour at more Truth in colouring and at the Artifice of Clear-obscure. He is much mistaken, if he imagines, from the Example of Hogarth, that these Things are not as necessary in ludicrous Paintings as in all others.

If Italy produces no more great History-Painters, as is often affirmed, she has still however some excellent Artists. Many of *Zuccarelli's* Pictures are incomparable. The two large ones he exhibited last Year are worth any Money.

Zaffanti gives a tolerable likeness of our Actors in particular Scenes in Comedy. But, though at the same Time represents not ill the supposed Emotions of their Minds, and though his Pencil is free, there is often a Frigidity in his Countenances, that is very unpleasant. In some of these Countenances this Frigidity is excessive. Witness, for one Instance, *Beard singing* in one of the Scenes in *Love in a Village*.

This Painter makes use of a certain Artifice, against which I would caution all of the Profession. In order to preserve in his Pictures an Union of Colour, which is a Thing necessary, he exhibits an Unity, a Oneness of Colour; which is disagreeable to the Eye, as well as very unnatural. We have likewise Landscape-Painters, who,

who, to preserve this Union, make every Object green, that enters into the Composition of their Pictures.

This Oneness of Colour is the Refuge of Men who are not Masters of their Art in Respect to colouring, and yet are conscious that all jarring of Colours is to be avoided: and true it is that a Man of little Judgment, that were to introduce into a Picture many different and strong Colours, would almost certainly make that Picture disagreeable by a Glaringness and Gawdiness void of all Harmony. But the greatest Colorists (such as *Titian*, *Rubens*, *Vandyke*, and a few others of the *Venetian* and *Flemish* Schools) by their Knowledge of the Agreement or Disagreement of different Colours with each other, have been able to introduce into their Pictures many strong and lively Colours, that give those Pictures a Strikingness and a Vigour, and at the same Time to preserve all the Harmony and Suavity that are necessary.

The Picture exhibited last Year by *Perry*, representing a Smith hearkening to a Piece of News related by a Taylor, (of which the Hint is taken from *Shakespear*) is an exceeding good one, and much superior to the Productions of a *Hogarth*. The Figures are correctly drawn; the Picture is well coloured, and has a very tolerable Effect in Regard to Light and Shadow: and the Expressions in the Countenances are strong without any unnatural Distortion of Features, and are exceedingly just. Two of these

E

Countenances

Countenances are, however, exceptionable. That of the Taylor is very much so. The Painter has made this Face disgustingly ugly, and there is no looking at it without Pain. Uglinefs (as I said before) is false Humour. He might have given his Taylor all the nincompoop Character that we commonly ascribe to Taylors, (though, by the Way I know no Reason for our ascribing that Character to them) without making him at all ugly. The Smith likewise in his Surprise opens his Eyes so as to discover the whole Iris; which gives a Ghastlinefs to his Countenance. The Painter might have contrived an equally strong Expression of Surprise, that should not at all have shock'd the Spectator.

Mrs Moser's Flower-Piece in Oil of last Year is a capital Performance, and that in Water-Colours a very good one.

Mortimer's Conversation-Pieces have a great deal of Merit.

To judge by what he has exhibited for two or three Years past, I should imagine *Stubbs* to be rather degenerating than improving; and yet, tho' many of his Pictures of Horses have been deservedly admired, there was still great Room for Improvement. A Painter, that introduces many Horses into a Picture, has an easy Opportunity, by a judicious Choice of different Colours for those Horses, of giving his Picture a considerable Effect in Regard to Clear-Obscure. *Stubbs* never availed himself of this. I think too that the silky Pencil he has gives these Animals an unnatural Appearance;

Appearance; and I likewise apprehend that he was always apt to give his Mares rather too thin and stringy a Countenance; by means of which they had somewhat of the Air of Stone-Horses. It may further be said that, though his Horses are not ill coloured, they are far from having the Truth of Colouring or the Roundness that we see in many of *Wouverman's*. In short, they had always a small Matter of the colour'd Print: and this I take to be owing in some Degree to his not laying a thicker Body of Colour where the Strength of the Light falls than in other Parts.

We are obliged to *Sir Joshua Reynolds* for having put an End to the Stiffness and the Sameness of Attitude there was in our English Portraits before he appeared. He has not only an infinitely greater Variety of natural, graceful and picturesque Attitudes than any English Painter that preceded him, but even a much greater, in my Opinion, than any foreign Painter whatsoever. But I am sorry to observe that, though he never was a first-rate Painter in Regard to Colouring, he is degenerated, in this particular, and not a little, within these seven Years, as he is likewise in his Pencilling. Several of the Pictures he has exhibited have had but a very small Share of Merit. We may reasonably attribute this to his having too much Business. There has been always a considerable Effect of Clear-Obscure in his Pictures, and they have seldom failed to catch the Eye. Yet at the same Time there has been a certain Confusion in them, and it has frequen-

Countenances are, however, exceptionable. That of the Taylor is very much so. The Painter has made this Face disgustingly ugly, and there is no looking at it without Pain. Uglinefs (as I said before) is false Humour. He might have given his Taylor all the nincompoop Character that we commonly ascribe to Taylors, (though, by the Way I know no Reason for our ascribing that Character to them) without making him at all ugly. The Smith likewise in his Surprise opens his Eyes so as to discover the whole Iris; which gives a Ghastlinefs to his Countenance. The Painter might have contrived an equally strong Expression of Surprise, that should not at all have shock'd the Spectator.

Mrs Moser's Flower-Piece in Oil of last Year is a capital Performance, and that in Water-Colours a very good one.

Mortimer's Conversation-Pieces have a great deal of Merit.

To judge by what he has exhibited for two or three Years past, I should imagine *Stubbs* to be rather degenerating than improving; and yet, tho' many of his Pictures of Horses have been deservedly admired, there was still great Room for Improvement. A Painter, that introduces many Horses into a Picture, has an easy Opportunity, by a judicious Choice of different Colours for those Horses, of giving his Picture a considerable Effect in Regard to Clear-Obscure. *Stubbs* never availed himself of this. I think too that the silky Pencil he has gives these Animals an unnatural Appearance;

Appearance; and I likewise apprehend that he was always apt to give his Mares rather too thin and stringy a Countenance; by means of which they had somewhat of the Air of Stone-Horses. It may further be said that, though his Horses are not ill coloured, they are far from having the Truth of Colouring or the Roundness that we see in many of *Wouverman's*. In short, they had always a small Matter of the colour'd Print: and this I take to be owing in some Degree to his not laying a thicker Body of Colour where the Strength of the Light falls than in other Parts.

We are obliged to *Sir Joshua Reynolds* for having put an End to the Stiffness and the Sameness of Attitude there was in our English Portraits before he appeared. He has not only an infinitely greater Variety of natural, graceful and picturesque Attitudes than any English Painter that preceded him; but even a much greater, in my Opinion, than any foreign Painter whatsoever. But I am sorry to observe that, though he never was a first-rate Painter in Regard to Colouring, he is degenerated, in this particular, and not a little, within these seven Years, as he is likewise in his Pencilling. Several of the Pictures he has exhibited have had but a very small Share of Merit. We may reasonably attribute this to his having too much Business. There has been always a considerable Effect of Clear-Obscure in his Pictures, and they have seldom failed to catch the Eye. Yet at the same Time there has been a certain Confusion in them, and it has frequen-

xxxiv. P R E F A C E.

ly happened that his Objects have not detached themselves well from each other. One Cause of this is a very odd and bad Method that he has of painting Clouds. These Clouds of his have something of the Appearance of Smoke, and, instead of being at a Distance in the Sky, they seem to advance and to mix themselves with the near Objects in the Picture. Herein some other Painters have been so weak as to imitate him. Many of his Hands likewise, where there has been any Fore-shortening, have been drawn in a lame unnatural Manner. Some of them are very bad.

West has a great deal of true Genius, and, considering he is yet but a young Fellow, bids fair to be a much greater History-Painter than *England* has ever yet bred. He visibly aims at excelling in all the Parts of Painting, Composition, Drawing, local Colour, Clear-Obfcure, and Expression. There is a Fire in his large Compositions, and great Expression of the Passions in many of his Countenances: but his Drawing is not so elegant, nor his local Colour so true as might be wished. He succeeds much better in Figures of a moderate size than in large ones. In the first his Pencilling is commonly free and masterly, though not mellow. His Hair, in particular, is sometimes insufferably harsh, and gives one the Idea of cast Iron rubb'd over with Paint. Some of his large Figures, besides their not being well pencill'd, are drawn in very bad Taste. That of *Jupiter*, where he approaches *Semele*, is shockingly mean and contemptible, and, even
if

if the Picture were an excellent one in other Respects, which it is not, would, as being a principal Figure, utterly spoil it. Perhaps the Advice hinted to *Wright of Derby* would not be improper for this Painter, and it might be best for him not to attempt large Figures.

His Picture of *Regulus* departing from *Rome*, exhibited last Year, is admirable for the Animatedness of the Composition, and the Force and Justness of many of the Expressions, and, though faulty in some Particulars, is a Performance not unworthy of any of the greatest Painters that have been.

Though I flatter myself these Reflections are all just, I am conscious they are far from being all the just Reflections that might be made upon the Works of these Painters. I make them merely upon Recollection, having never till now committed any Thing to Paper upon the Subject, or had any Intention of ever doing it: and many other Observations might, without Doubt, be made upon these Performances, were a Man to study them.

I have sometimes indeed had Thoughts of writing a Treatise on Painting in general, having never yet seen any, with which I was thoroughly satisfied. And this I should certainly have done, had my Income enabled me to travel for a few Years: for I am convinced that many just Observations remain still to be made upon the Works of the greatest Masters, that we often admire where there is little Ground for so doing, and
that

that the Art of Painting was never yet carried, by many Degrees, so near as is commonly thought, either to absolute Perfection, or to the Perfection to which human Abilities are well capable of carrying it.

To give only *one* Instance of the Implicitness of Critics. *Raphael* is universally acknowledg'd to be unequalled by any other Painter in drawing the human Figure. On account of this Superiority, he is commonly supposed to be perfect in this Part of Painting: and whoever were to find Fault with the Shape of any of his Figures would run the Risk of being thought very ignorant. But let any Man of Sense consider without Prejudice many of the Figures even in the most admired Pictures of *Raphael*, and I am convinced he will own that this Imputation of Ignorance might possibly be unjust. His celebrated *St. John in the Desert* in the Duke of Orleans's Collection (which is engraved, and the Print of it well known in *London*) represents, to judge by the Countenance, a Boy of about twelve or thirteen Years of Age. But, to judge by the rest of his Person, one would imagine him to be not only a man grown, but a Man of enormous Strength. And is not this wrong? Besides the Inconsistency of so young a Face with the Body of a Man full grown, what is there in the Character of *St. John*, even supposing him in the Vigour of his Age, that requires this Tumour of Muscle and Knottiness of Form? Now *Raphael* has been guilty of the same Fault in great Numbers

bers of his Figures : among others, in the little *Christ* in the famous *Holy Family* at *Versailles* engraved by *Edelinck*, of which a Copy was sold at *Sir Luke Schaub's* Sale for above seven Hundred Pound, and another the other Day in *Pallmall* for three Hundred and Sixty Guineas. But, in short, it was the Fashion in *Raphael's* Time to imitate *Michael Angelo* in this Particular, who gave an Extravagance of Strength to almost every Figure he drew : and it has been too much the Practice ever since. A certain Degree of Strength is indeed necessary. The want of it gives a *Mean-ness*. But to make Strength the distinguishing Character of all or most of the Figures introduced into a Picture is absurd. Few Painters seem have had much Notion of *Elegance* of Form.

Before I have done with the Subject of *Painting*, let me advise every Person that visits *Antwerp*, and that has any Love for this Art, not to neglect to see the Picture at the High Altar of the Church of the *Recollet-Friars*, and that at the High Altar of the Church near the *Fish-Market*, both by *Rubens*. The first represents *The Crucifixion*, and is perhaps his Master-Piece. The other *The Raising the Cross*. Common Report indeed has long given the Reputation of his Master-Piece to *The taking down from the Cross* at one of the Altars in the Cathedral. But here I will venture to contradict common Report, and to affirm that there is even no Comparison to be made. The three best Pieces by *Rubens* to be seen

xxxviii. P R E F A C E

seen in the Churches of *Antwerp* are the *Crucifixion* and *The Raising the Cross* just mentioned, and *The Assumption of the Virgin* at the High Altar of the Cathedral. That of *The taking down from the Cross* is but the fourth in Merit. But this Picture, (forsooth) for which they tell you at *Antwerp* the late Duke of *Cumberland* offered ten Thousand Pounds, is covered with a Case: and 'tis the Case that has given it its mighty Reputation. It is indeed a fine Piece: but I was strangely disappointed when I first saw it.

A Picture at one of the Altars in *Dunkirk*, painted by *Pourbus*, has likewise, merely by being covered with a Case, gained the Reputation of being one of the finest Things in the World.

In one of the Rooms of the Monastery of the *Austin-Friars* at *Antwerp* there is an exquisite *Christ upon the Cross* (a small Picture) by *Vandyke*, which few Travellers hear of.

But the most curious Piece in that City some few Years ago, and perhaps one of the most curious in the World, was a Candle-Light by *Skalken*, in which were four or five Figures larger than what he painted in common. I was never so struck as at the first Sight of it, and could not help exclaiming that I had never seen a Picture till then. It belonged to Mr *Van Zuster*, now dead, a very rich Man, who lived in the *Place de Mere*. But, if his Heir have the least Affection for Painting, it is still probably in the same House.

I am sorry not to have seen, not having heard of it while I was in *Flanders*, a Picture at *Bruges*

Bruges said to be the Joint-Performance of *Van Thulden*, *Rubens* and *Vandyke*, and to be equal to any Thing in that Country. The Subject is *The Continence of Scipio*. It contains twenty-six Figures as large as the Life, and is near ten Foot high, and above twelve in Length. The Bridegroom and Bride are represented by the Resemblances of *Vandyke* and *Rubens's* second Wife. The Emperor *Charles the 7th*, as I am credibly inform'd, would have purchased it, and sent one of the Princes of his Court to *Bruges* for that Purpose. An Agent of the late King of *Denmark* offered a very large Sum of Money for it; as the States of *Holland* had done before, intending it as a Present to the King of *Prussia*; & also the States of *Flanders*, who likewise design'd it for a present to the late Emperor. But the then Possessor, a rich Man, would not leave it upon any Terms. It is now the Joint-Property of *Messieurs du Hamel*, his Grandsons, and is to be disposed of at a Price any Way proportioned to it's Merit.

Descamps, it seems, speaks of this Picture with high Elogiums in his *Lives of the Painters*.

I cannot leave this Subject without deploring the Want of Judgment of many of our People of large Fortune, who frequently give extravagant Prices for Trash, while they suffer most excellent Pieces to go for a small Matter. At *Sir Luke Schaub's* Sale (whitch Sale may justly be called *The Triumph of Ignorance*) many Pictures sold at above a Hundred Pounds a-piece, which

XI. P R E F A C E.

would have been dear at Four Guineas. One in particular, a small Picture of a Boy (falsely called a *Vandyke* in the Catalogue) went at a hundred and twenty Guineas, and was not worth above three. The Copy from *Raphael* which was but an indifferent one, and which, as I said just now, sold for above seven hundred Pounds, would have been well sold at Fifty. The *Sigismunda* (falsely called a *Corregio*) which the Executrix was so unknowing as to buy in at four hundred Pounds, was not worth twenty. The View of *Antwerp*, said to be the joint Performance of *Rubens*, *Paul Brill*, and two more, was a damaged Picture, and had never been an extraordinary one. It went at five hundred and twenty five Guineas, and would have been full dear at fifteen. I saw about six Years ago, at *Antwerp* itself, a View of that City, a much better than Sir *Luke Schaub*'s had ever been, sold for twelve Guineas and a half.

There is at *Versailles* a small *Holy Family* of *Raphael*'s, engraved by *Poilly*. It is that where the little *Christ* leans over his Mother's Knee, and takes St. *John* under the Chin. In the Spring of the Year 62, a villainous Copy of this Picture, but impudently called the Original, sold at *Prestage*'s for a hundred and fifty Guineas. It was not worth five Shillings.

In the two Days Sale at *Chriffie*'s about a Month ago, viz. the 9th and 10th of *February*, two dull allegorical Pictures, said to be by *Paul Veronese*, sold, one for a hundred and thirty Guineas,

neas, the other for a hundred and twenty-five. The first would have been dear enough at twelve Guineas, and the other at six.

In the same Sale a Picture of *Vouet's* representing the entombing our Saviour, but infinitely preferable to the greatest Part of this Painter's Works, a Picture excellently well composed, well drawn, admirable for the Expressions, and pleasingly pencil'd, a Performance, in short, that would have done Honour to *Raphael* himself, went with great Difficulty up to fourteen Guineas.

Among the Pictures that Lord Orford the Minister had in his House at *Chelsea*, there was a most exquisite small Dutch Piece of *St. Francis* praying. In particular, the Expression of Devotion is equal to any Expression ever produced by *Raphael*. I bought this admirable Picture, in a Crowd of pretended Connoisseurs, at the shamefully low Price of eight-and-forty Shillings. Were I a Man of Fortune, two hundred Guineas. should not purchase it.

The best Picture in *Richardson* the Painter's Collection, was a Portrait of the famous Pirate *Barbarossa*, by *Giorgioni*. It was equal to the best of *Vandyke's* or *Titian's*: and this Picture, which ought to have fetch'd a hundred and fifty Guineas, went for nine and a half.

In short, there are few Sales of Pictures, that don't furnish Instances of gross Ignorance, either in giving a high Price for what is of little or no Value, or in letting fine Things go for a Trifle.

TO Return to my *Remarks on the English Language*. Though I despair that any one Reader will think them *all* just, I hope there will be no Person of Sense but will allow they may be useful *upon the whole*: and, if they excite any more discerning Man to produce a better Performance of the Sort, I shall be glad to have been the Occasion of his so doing.

Should my Book have but a dull Sale, it won't be the first Disappointment of the Kind that I have met with. I publish'd in the Year 66 what I then thought and still think as diverting a Thing as ever appear'd; by which, however, instead of getting Money, I am about eight Guineas a Loser. Don't let the Reader call me a Coxcomb for expressing myself in this Manner. What I think so very diverting is not of my own Invention. It is only a Collection of Wit-ticisms and Strokes of Humour. I had never seen a Book of Jest's that pleased me: Scarcely any Collector has known either how to *chuse* or how to *relate* a Story: and having at Times, merely for my Amusement, committed to Paper a considerable Number of what I thought Pieces of Wit or Humour, I at Length took it into my Head to publish them: and I put my Name in the Title Page. I printed fifteen hundred.

They had hardly any Sale. Thereupon I made presents of some Hundreds, and sold six hundred at a very low Price to an ignorant Book-seller; of which I soon repented, for I found the Booby had altered the Title-page, and had inserted

serted a long Account of *Humbugs, Funny Jokes, Comundrums, Arch Waggeries, &c.* with my Name at the Bottom of all this Nonsense.

The Title, that I had myself prefix'd to the Book, was *Witticisms and Strokes of Humour*.—Some of the Copies are still remaining where these Remarks are fold. The Price is but a poor *Shilling*; and such as are pleased with the following Specimens will not think that Trifle ill bestowed upon the Book. The first is a Piece of conceal'd and refin'd Satyr. The second, a Stroke of witty and humorous Banter: the third, Humour with something of Archness; and the last, which is very low, Humour proceeding from downright Ignorance.

The last of those Sovereign Princes, who stiled themselves *Dukes of Burgundy*, besieged a small Town in *Switzerland* of little Defence, called *Morat*: whereupon the *Switzers* raised an Army, gave him Battle, and obliged him to retire with great Loss. The Inhabitants of *Morat* then collected the Bones of the slain *Burgundians*, piled them in a Chapel in their Town, and plac'd an Inscription there to this Effect; “The Army of *Charles Duke of Burgundy*, having besieged *Morat*, has left this Monument
“of its Enterprize.”

Diogenes, being present at a Performance of some very unskillful Archers, went and plac'd himself close to the Mark. Being asked why
“ he

he put himself there, "I am afraid," said he, "if I stand any where else, some of their Arrows will hit me."

A Gentleman seeing a Country-fellow with his newly married Wife, "let me give thy Wife a Kifs," said he, "when I marry, thou shalt kifs mine:" to which the Peasant consented. Shortly after, the Gentleman marries, and, according to his Promise, permits the Countryman to give his Wife a Kifs. "Madam," said the Fellow, after having kifs'd her, "since my Master is so honest, and keeps his Word so well, I am very sorry that, instead of only giving my Wife a Kifs, he did not go to Bed with her."

An Alehouse-girl took it into her Head to be catechized at Church. The Parson asking her her Name, "Lord, Sir," said she, "how can you pretend not to know my Name, when you come to our House so often, and cry ten Times in an Evening, *Nan, you Whore, bring us another Full-pot?*"

I was going to throw up my Pen without mentioning an Over-sight, that I have myself discovered in my Remarks. I say in Page 47,

"In Poetry, where greater Liberties in Point of Stile may be taken than in Prose, *whom* may, for the Sake of Sound, be used instead of *who*, especially if so placed as for the false Grammar

“ Grammar not to be too glaring ; which *Pope*
 “ has very well observed in the *Dunciad*, where
 “ he speaks of *Fleet - Ditch* in the following
 “ Manner,

“ *The King of Dikes, than whom no Sluice of Mud*
 “ *With deeper Sable blots the Silver Flood.*

“ To have written strictly good English, he must
 “ have said *than who no Sluice of Mud*, since the
 “ Word is in the same Case with *Sluice*, which
 “ is a Nominative.

Now one would imagine, from what I say of
 the Poet's having taken Care the false Grammar
 should not be too glaring, that he had placed the
whom at a Distance from *no Sluice*, whereas it
 stands close to it.



German not to be so doing; which Pope
his very own obtained in the present, where
he speaks of it - I think in the following
Manner,

“The King of Spain, being a Catholic, and
a very good man, and a very good king.”

To have written in the year 1714, he must
have been a very good man, and a very good king,
in the year 1714, when the Pope was dead, which
is a very good man, and a very good king.

Now one would imagine, from what I say of
the Pope's having taken the title German
that he was a very good man, and a very good king,
that he was a very good man, and a very good king,
that he was a very good man, and a very good king.





REMARKS

ON THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

I. O P P O S I T E.

THE Word *opposite* is frequently used as a Preposition, to signify *over-against*.

Examples.] *He lives opposite the Exchange : Those two Men live opposite each other : Whitehall is opposite the Horse-Guards.* This is not good English.—It is necessary to add to *opposite* the Word *to*.—*He lives opposite to the Exchange.—Those two Men live opposite to each other.—Whitehall is opposite to the Horse-Guards.*

A

2d. Write

II. W R I T E.

This Word is often used (especially by People in Trade) with a Dative Case following it, without the Article *To* prefixed to that Dative, even though there be no accusative Case after it.

Examples.] *He is gone into the Country, and has promised to write me often.—They are so punctual in their Correspondence, that they write each other every Week.—I won't fail to write you soon.* This is very barbarous Expression. It is absolutely necessary to prefix to the Dative the Article *To*.

Examples.] *He is gone into the Country, and has promised to write to me often.—They are so punctual in their Correspondence, that they write to each other every Week.—I will not fail to write to you soon.*

Indeed, where an accusative Case follows the Dative, the Article becomes unnecessary, and is seldom used. For Instance; *He writes me Word that the Affair is finished.—We write each other very long Letters.—I have written her a long Account of that Transaction.*

Nor

Nor is the Article absolutely necessary, where the accusative of the relative Pronoun *Which* or *That* is supposed, without being expressed.

Examples.] *The Letter I wrote him never came to Hand.—The News I shall write her to Night will please her greatly.*—Here the Pronoun relative *Which*, or *That*, is supposed: For the Sense is, *the Letter that (or which) I wrote him, never came to Hand.—The News, that (or which) I shall write her to-night, will please her greatly.*

III. Omission of the Nominative of the Relative Pronouns *Who*, *That* and *Which*.

THE Nominative of the Relative Pronouns *Who*, *That* and *Which*, is frequently omitted by bad Writers, (and sometimes, tho' rarely, even by good ones) and left to be supposed. Instead, for Instance, of saying, *the Man, who lived there lately, is removed.—The Article, that was inserted in Yesterday's Paper, is not true.—The Wine, which pleases me best, is Claret.* They would say, *The Man, lived there lately, is removed.—The Article was inserted in Yesterday's*

Paper is not true.—The Wine pleases me best, is Claret.—This is very bad Expression, and renders the Sentence obscure.

There are, however, in *Shakespear* and other great Writers, some few Instances, where the Omission adds to the Spirit of the Sentence, without causing any Obscurity. It may likewise now and then be borne with in common Conversation. Yet in general it has a bad Effect in Conversation, and a still much worse in Writing.

IV. *As follow* used for *as follows*.

SOME good Writers (among others, *Addison*) express themselves in this Manner, *The Articles were as follow.—The Circumstances of the Affair are as follow.—The Conditions of the Agreement are as follow.*

I conceive this Expression to be wrong, and that *as follows* ought to be here used, and not *as follow*. What deceives these Writers is, that the preceding Substantive is in the Plural Number. But this Substantive is by no Means
a no-

a nominative Case to *follow* or *follows*. Neither is there any intervening Pronoun between this Substantive and this Verb, that is relative to the Former, and serves as a Nominative to the Latter. If the Verb *follow* or *follows*, have any Nominative, it is the Pronoun *It*, which is supposed, and is here unrelative, as in many other Cases: In these, for Instance; *It is very hot Weather,—It is cold.*

The Sense then is, *The Articles were as it here follows.—The Circumstances of the Affair are as it here follows.—The Conditions of the Agreement are as it here follows.* Consequently *follows* ought to be used, and not *follow*. Indeed, if the Word *such* preceded the *as*, *follow* would be right, and not *follows*; because *such as* would be equivalent to *these which*.

V. *Hit* for *Throw*.

THE Word *hit* is commonly used in Oxfordshire and some of the adjacent Counties, even by People of good Education, to signify *tofs*, *throw* or *fling*. It is necessary to inform them, that *to hit* signifies *to strike*, and not to *tofs* or *throw*. 6th.

VI. The Words *Ago* and *Since*.

THESSE two Words are not to be used together. *It is not above two Months ago since he left the University.—It is three Years ago since his Father died.—*These Expressions don't make Sense; the Word *since* being equivalent to *ago that*.

The proper Expressions are, *It is not above two Months ago that he left the University.—It is not above two Months since he left the University, It is three Years ago that his Father died.—It is three Years since his Father died.*

VII. *C H A Y*.

THIS Word is used by great Numbers of People, to signify *Chaise*. What deceives them is, that the Letter *S* in the Word *Chaise* being the last Letter that is pronounced, they take the Word to be in the Plural Number: consequently they imagine that the Singular Number must be *Chay*. But *Chaise* is singular, and the Plural is *Chaises*.—*He keeps a Chaise.—He keeps two Chaises.—*These are the proper Expressions. As to *Chay*, there is no such Word.

8th. *WENT*.

VIII. *W E N T.*

THE Word *Went* is not to be used with *have, had* or *having*.—*I should have went. If I had went.—Having went.*—This is bad English.

The proper Word is *gone*.—*I should have gone. If I had gone.—Having gone.*

IX. *Different to.*

D*ifferent to* is an Expression often used by good Writers: Yet I can't help thinking it to be exceptionable.--*This is different to that—They are different to each other.*—These Expressions seem hardly to make Sense. Is not the Word *From* here more natural than *To*? and does it not make better Sense? For Instance; *This is different from that.—They are different from each other.*—We don't use the Word *To* with the Verb: Nor do I see why we should use it with the adjective. If any One should say, *This differs to that.—They differ to each other.* The Impropriety of the Expression would be glaring, and would shock every Hearer. I know that
Custom

Custom often reconciles Improperities of this Sort : yet there are some Cases, where it never reconciles them entirely : and this appears to me to be one. I would therefore give my Vote for *different from*, and would banish the Expression of *different to*.

X. INGENUITY.

IT is a considerable Blemish in our Language, that the Word *Ingenuity* has two Senses; for hereby it often becomes unintelligible. If I hear it said simply, that such an One is a Man of great Ingenuity, how is it possible I should know the Meaning of the Expression? It may signify either that he is *ingenious*, or that he is *ingenuous*. We have (it is true) many Words in English (and it is the same in other Languages) that have each of them more than one Meaning. But this seldom occasions any Obscurity, because the Subject spoken of commonly determines the Sense. With Regard to the Word *Ingenuity*, it is otherwise. It being made use of to signify two excellent mental Qualities, [*A-*
bility

None are used adverbially even by Persons of Distinction ; the first to signify *at all*, the other *not at all*.—*Is she recovered from her Illness any ?* Would one of these Gentry say : meaning *Is she at all* (or *in any Degree*) *recovered ?*—*No*, says another : *She is recovered none*.—Surely there cannot be a greater Violation of Grammar and Common-Sense. It is necessary to inform these North-western People of Fashion, that *any* and *none* have not the Significations they give them ; that they are Adjectives, and are never to be used adverbially.

XII. D E M E A N.

THIS Word is used by all the lower People, as well as by great Numbers of their Betters, to signify *Debase* or *Lessen*. It is also found in the same Sense in bad Writers. *Richardson* often presents his Readers with it in his emetic History of *Pamela*. Nay, if I mistake not, I have met with it once or twice in *Swift* ; and I think it likewise once occurs in my Lord *Bolingbroke's Oldcastle's Remarks upon English History*. If these two Writers have really employed the Word in that Sense, it must undoubtedly have been thro' Oversight. They could never be

be ignorant that *To Demean* signifies *to behave, to comport, and not to debase or lessen.*

What causes the Mistake in so many Persons is the Syllable *mean*. The Word *mean* signifying *low and contemptible*; and the Word *Meanness* *Lowness*, they imagine from thence, that *to demean* must signify *to make contemptible or cast a Meanness upon.*

As to the Substantive *Demeanour*, it is a Word the lower People are not acquainted with. If they were once to get hold of it, I make no Doubt they would misapply it as much as they do the Verb.

XIII. IF IN CASE.

THIS Expression, which is the same as *if if*, and is consequently Nonsense, is continually in the Mouths of the lower People, who seem to have a mighty Affection for it, and to think it nervous and elegant. It is likewise not infrequently used by many who ought to know better. Yet these Words would not be improper, provided the *If* made Part of one Member of a Sentence, and the *in case* of another. Suppose I say, for Instance, *If, in Case of a*
B 2
War

War between France and England, the King of Prussia should join with France; this is very good Sense. Here the *If* belongs to *the King of Prussia should join with France*, while the *in case* belongs to *of a War between France and England*: and, in order to make the Distinction, it is necessary to put a Comma at *if*, and another at *England*. But, as I have already said, these Words as they are commonly used, are Nonfense.

XIV. *ARRANT. ERRANT.*

THESE two Words are sometimes confounded by Writers.

Errant signifies *wandering*, according to its Etymology, but is now seldom or never used in that Sense, except with the Substantive *Knight*. *A Knight-errant*.

Arrant signifies *Meer, Downright*, and is used only in discommending, unless it be in a facetious and bantering Stile. We say, for Example. *An arrant Fool, An arrant Coxcomb, An arrant Knave*. But Nobody says *An arrant Man of Sense, An arrant modest Man, An arrant Man of Probity*.

Yet

Yet in a facetious and bantering Stile, as I have hinted, *Arrant* may be used in speaking of agreeable or commendable Qualities. If, for Instance, I am told of several Witticisms uttered by a Man from whom I should not have expected them, or of Exertions of Courage by another, there would be no Impropriety in my saying, *I find he's an arrant Wit,—Why, he's an arrant Hero.*

Such Authors as confound these Words, seldom use *Arrant* for *Errant*, but frequently *Errant* for *Arrant*, (Instances of which there are in Lord *Shaftsbury* and some others who pass for good Writers) making it to signify *Meer*, which is the Signification only of *Arrant*. But, in speaking, the other Mistake more generally prevails; *Arrant* being often pronounced instead of *Errant*; and especially upon the Stage, where there is a most shameful Ignorance both of Grammar and Pronunciation. *Knight-arrants* are often talked of there: but we seldom hear of a *Knight-errant*.

XV. A Word denoting a Number, joined with a Noun Substantive.

WHERE this occurs, though the Number be plural, the Substantive (or what would

would be a Substantive if it were uncompound-
ed) is to be written without an *s* at the End. For
Instance, *The five-bell Tavern, The three-tun Inn,*
Atwenty-gun Ship, A four-wheel Chaise. These
are the proper Expressions; and not *The five-*
bells Tavern, The three-tuns Inn, Atwenty-guns
Ship, A four-wheels Chaise.

Yet many People affect, both in writing and
speaking, to use the *s*, and seem to value them-
selves upon their extraordinary Correctness.
But they ought to consider, that in compound
Words of this Sort, what would be a Substan-
tive, if it stood single, is no longer such, but
is become part of an Adjective. For Example,
in the Instances here brought, *Five-bell, Three-*
tun, Twenty-gun and *Four-wheel* are Adjectives,
of which the respective Substantives are *Tavern,*
Inn, Ship and *Chaise.*

XVI. A R R I V E.

THIS Word, where it is used in the pro-
per Sense, is followed by the Article *at*,
and not by *To*.—

Examples.]

Examples.] *We shall arrive at London early.—You will arrive at your Country-house before Night.* A Person, that should say *We shall arrive to London early—You will arrive to your Country House before Night*—would not talk English. And yet there are People of Education ignorant enough to express themselves in this awkward Manner.

In Conformity to this Rule, it is necessary to say *arrive there*, and not *arrive thither*; which last Expression is not good English.

Yet, where the Word *arrive* is figurative, *To* and *At* are used indifferently. *He is arrived at great Perfection—He is arrived to great Perfection.*—Both these Expressions are proper.

XVII. *Get thither. Get there. Go thither. Go there.*

THOUGH *arrive thither* is not good English, *Get thither* is very proper, and is rather more elegant than *Get there*.

Go thither—Whither are you going? and come hither—are much better than *Go there—Where are you going?—and Come here.*

Again

XVIII. AGAIN. PRIZES.

AMONG other Instances of Ignorance, that we meet with upon the Stage, is the improper Use of the Words *Again* and *Prizes*. *Again* is used by many of the Players instead of *Against*, (a shrewd sign of a very low Education) and *Prizes* instead of *Prices*. *We have them of all Prizes*, says *Locket* upon the Stage, where *Macheath's* Irons are put on.

These People ought to know that *Prices* is here the proper Word, and not *Prizes*. What is paid for the Purchase of any Thing is it's *Price*. As to *Prize*, it signifies a *Booty* or *Capture*, a *Benefit* gained by a *Ticket* in a *Lottery*, and likewise the *Reward* given to the *Victor* in any *Trial* of Skill.

One can't help blushing for these Players, to think they must also be told that *Again* signifies *Once more*, and that *Against* means *Opposite* (or *Opposed*) to.

XIX. Famous, or rather Infamous.

THIS Expression is found in many Authors, who seem to value themselves not a little upon

upon it, and to think it mighty smart. *He was famous, or rather infamous, for his Cruelty*, says one.—*He was famous, or rather infamous, for his Debaucheries*, say another.—*She was famous, or rather infamous, for her lewdness*, says a third. And yet, in Reality, there is no Smartness in this. It has Nothing of the lively Antithesis, which these Writers imagine it to have. The Opposition between *Famous* and *Infamous* lies only in the Sound, and not in the Sense: for these two Words have not Senses contrary to each other. *Famous* signifies *Renowned, much known*. But *Infamous* does not signify *Obscure* or *Unknown*. It signifies *Vile, Scandalous, Base*. 'Tis true it likewise implies *Of evil Report*. But even in this Sense it can't properly be opposed to *Famous* or *Renowned*, the opposite of which is (as I have hinted) *Obscure* or *Unknown*.

Let us put another Phrase of the same Import in the Room of *Famous*, and we shall see the Nothingness of the Thought. For Instance, *He was well known, or rather infamous, for the Wickedness of his Life*. What a poor, unmeaning Speech is this! and how impertinently does the *Or rather* come in! In short, this Expression of *Famous, or rather infamous*, though it is to be found in some tolerable Wri-

ters, is very childish and silly ; and I would caution every one against the Use of it.

XX. HUMOROUS. HUMOURSOM.

THOUGH *Humoursom*, instead of *Humorous*, be chiefly heard among the low People, (none of whom, in all Probability, will ever study this Book, to learn good English) yet, as there are few bad Expressions used by the Vulgar, but what sometimes make their Way into better Company, it is proper to take Notice that the Word, which implies *Comical*, is *Humorous*, and not *Humoursom* ; the Signification of which last Word is *Peevish*, *Froward*, *Hard to please*.

There is extant a Letter written by Congreve, wherein he condemns the Word *Humour* as made to signify *What is Comical* or *Facetious*. He seems to affirm this is not the real Meaning of it, and that the true Sense of *Humour* is *What is Characteristic of a certain Temper*. I do not recollect his very Words : But these, which I have employed, convey at least the Idea, which, as he contends, ought to be conveyed by the Word *Humour*. So that, according to him, a Stroke, which characterises a Man, and
expresses

expresses his peculiar Turn of Mind, is to be called *Humour*; and such Stroke has Nothing the more of *Humour* for exciting Mirth.

Now it is to be considered that Words are Nothing at all in themselves. They signify that, and that only, which by common Consent is understood by them: and it is undeniable that the Word *Humour* is received by all People of Education (and has been so for a long Time) in the Sense he does not allow it to have. We find Instances of it in *Shakespear*, who wrote above a Hundred and fifty Years ago. The Word then being universally understood to imply *What excites Mirth*, this is of Course the Signification of it: To which it is no sort of Prejudice that it also bears another Signification, there being many Words that have different Senses.

XXI. *Adverbs and Participles improperly disjoined.*

IT is common for People to express themselves in the following Manner. *I don't know so well a bred Man—You seldom see so well a made Woman—I never rode so ill a going Horse—I never saw so poorly a painted Picture.*

This is wrong. The *A* ought to follow the Participle, not to precede it; and the Adverb and Participle ought to be joined together by a Hyphen, and to make but one Word. For Instance, *I don't know so well-bred a Man—You seldom see so well-made a Woman—I never rode so ill-going a Horse—I never saw so poorly-painted a Picture.*

XXII. *Had retired for several Years past.*

WE often find in our News-papers Paragraphs penn'd in the following Manner. *On such a Day died at—— Mr. ——, who having acquired a good Fortune in Business, had retired for some Years past.*

This is an improper Expression. These Printers ought to say either, *who, having acquired a good Fortune, retired some Years ago—* or, *who, having acquired a good Fortune, had been retired for some Years past*; of which two Expressions the first is the most easy and natural. In that which they use, the *Had retired* and the *For* are incompatible with each other, the *For* here signifying *During*. It therefore implies that the deceased had retired during several Years; which either has no Sense at all

all, or signifies that he spent several Years in the act of retiring. But there is a wide Difference between *spending several Years in the act of retiring* and *being retired* (or in Retirement) *during several Years.*

'Tis true the Words *Retire* and *For* are sometimes very properly used together: But in this last-mentioned Case, the Word *For* has not the Signification of *During*. Suppose, for Instance, a Man has danced at a Ball till he is fatigued. He says to a Friend, *I'll retire into another Room for half an Hour, and then come in again.* Here the Word *For*, as I have said, does not signify *During*. He *retires* (or *is retiring*) only while he is passing from the Ball-room into the Room where he intends to rest. When he is in that Room, he is no longer *retiring*: For he is then *retired* or *in retirement*. In like Manner, a Man who has quitted the Business he was following in *London* and is now settled in the Country, is *retired*, (or *in retirement* :) but he does not *retire*; he is not *retiring*; for he *retires* (or *is retiring*) only while he is going from *London* to the Place where he settles.

It would be therefore proper (as I have already hinted) for these Printers to say, *He re-*
tired

tired some Years ago, or He had been retired for some Years past. But, when they say He had retired for some Years past, they talk Nonsense.

XXIII. *The Note of Interrogation improperly used.*

IT is common with Writers to put a Note of Interrogation where they only make Mention of a Question's being asked, without employing the very Words which form the Question. Examples. *I saw your Aunt the other Day, who enquired when I heard from you last?—I visited your Sister yesterday. She asked me when I thought you would be in Town?* This is wrong. There ought to be no Note of Interrogation, since there is no Question.

Indeed though the Writer asks no Question himself, if the Interrogatory which he mentions, be put in the Form of a Question, the Note is very proper. As, for Instance, *As I was talking with your Aunt the other Day, when said she, did you hear from my Nephew last?—As I was yesterday upon a Visit to your Sister, when, said she, do you imagine my Brother will be in Town?*

An

XXIV. An improper Use of the Pronoun
relative *H E*.

THERE are many Writers, who introduce this Pronoun as a Relative to the indefinite Noun *One*. Instead of saying, *Unless one be very cautious, one will be liable to be deceived by pretended Friends—If one indulge much in Eating and Drinking, one almost certainly suffers for it in Point of Health—*They would say, *Unless one be very cautious, he will be liable to be deceived by pretended Friends--If one indulge much in Eating and Drinking, He almost certainly suffers for it in Point of Health.*

This is not good English. The *One* here is not the Unit in Number. It has the Sense of the *On* in the French Tongue, from which it is taken, and does not suffer a relative Pronoun.

To shew the Impropriety of the above Use of the Word *He*, let us suppose an Assembly of Women, where the Conversation runs upon the Pleasure they feel in being admired by the male Sex, and that one of the Company says, *One can't possibly help being delighted with the Admiration of the Men. Let her make what Use of her Reason*

Reason she will, she is still highly pleased with it. Will any one pretend to say this is English? No Person of tolerable Taste would endure either the *She*, the Pronoun Substantive *Her*, or the Pronoun adjective *Her*. And yet this Expression would be proper, if the *He* could at any Time with Propriety be used as a Relative to this indefinite Noun *One*. This Woman ought to repeat the *One*, and to say, *One can't possibly help being delighted with the Admiration of the Men.* Let one make what Use of one's Reason one will, one is still highly pleased with it. There is Nothing offensive in the Recurrence of the Word *One*.

It is likewise wrong to use either *Him*, *Her*, *Himself* or *Herself*, as the Genitive, Dative, Accusative or Ablative of this indefinite Noun. The proper Genitives, Datives Accusatives, and Ablatives are *One* and *One's-self*. For Instance, *He watches his Opportunities to take one at a Disadvantage.—He is of a friendly Temper, and does one all the Service he can.—The Love of one's-self.—One sometimes finds an unexpected Resource is one's-self.*

Apostrophes

XXV. *Apostrophes improperly used.*

IT is a common Practice even with good Writers to put an Apostrophe between the *A* and the *S* of the Words *Ideas* and *Operas*, and of many others, of which the Singular ends with the Letter *A*.

This is certainly wrong: For why should an Apostrophe be placed where there is no Letter omitted?

They put this Apostrophe likewise between the *O* and the *S* of the Plurals of *Virtuoso*, *Virago*, and of some other Words ending with *O*, and write *Virtuoso's*, *Virago's*, &c.

Indeed, as to these two Words, they may possibly pretend there is an *E* omitted, and that the Apostrophe is the Mark of that Elision.

In the first Place, I can see no Reason for an *E* in either of these two Words. I think the true Spelling is *Virtuosos*, *Viragos*. But, even supposing these Plurals to have an *E*, why should the *E* be cut off any more than in *Toes*, *Foes*, *Sloes*? There is not the least Ground imaginable for such Practice, and the Words

D

ought

ought to be written at full length, the Pronunciation being the Same when the *E* is inserted as when it is omitted and it's Place supplied with an Apostrophe.

The same Absurdity prevails in Regard to those Words, whose singular Number ends with an *S*; as *Genius*, *Summons*, *Chorus*, &c. The Plurals of these Words ought to be written *Geniuses*, *Summonses*, *Choruses*, &c.

XXVI. *Other improper Elisions.*

Nothing is more frequent than, in writing the preterperfect Tense active, or the Participle passive of a Verb that ends with a Consonant to spell it with a single Consonant, if the *E*, the last Letter but one, be cut off. Example; *He received a Blow that stun'd him—He was stun'd with the Blow.*

This is wrong. The Word ought to be written with a double Consonant. *A Blow that stunn'd him—He was stunn'd.*

By this Practice of cutting off one of the Consonants with the *E*, many Words of very different Meanings, and pronounced differently,

ly, and which, when written at full Length, are likewise differently Spelt, are confounded, by being spelt alike. For Instance, *Tiled* and *Tilled*, *Filed* and *Filled*, *Bared* and *Barred*, *Planed* and *Planned*, *Striped* and *Stripped*, *Tuned* and *Tunned*, *Scared* and *Scarred*, *Robed* and *Robbed*, *Stiled* and *Stilled*, with several others. It hurts the Eye to see Words of such different Senses and of different Sounds, spelt in the same Manner.

Instead of *I'll*, the Contraction of *I will*, many People write *I'le*. I don't see what Right the *E* has in a Word, when contracted, which admits no such Letter, when written at full Length: And I think it offensive to the Eye. Those, who make Use of it, are fearful perhaps that the Word, when written with a double *L*, will be mistaken for the Word *Ill*. But the Apostrophe seems to be a sufficient Guard against any such Mis-apprehension.

XXVII. *A wrong Method of speaking of a double Letter.*

THE Mention of a double *L* puts me in Mind of a Mistake, that Writers often commit in speaking of a double Letter. In-

stead of saying a *DD*, or a *double D*, they would say a *double DD*. But a double *DD* is a quadruple *D*, in which there are four *Ds*: and yet they mean to speak but of two. They should say either a *DD* or a *double D*.

XXVIII. *An Oversight, of which Authors are now and then guilty.*

WE sometimes, even in tolerable Writers, meet with Expressions to the same Purpose with this, *If I mistake not, I think so and so*; which is an Absurdity; for surely every Man knows whether he thinks a Thing or not. We say indeed jestingly of an irresolute Person that they don't know their own Mind.

The *If I mistake not* and the *I think* are therefore not both to be used.

There is an Oversight of this kind in *Moliere's Comedy of The School for Husbands*.

XXIX. *To Fly, Flee, Flow, Over-flow.*

THE preterperfect Tense of the first of these Verbs when it signifies *To move with Wings*, is *Flew*—*The Bird flew away*.

With

With the Auxiliaries, *Flown* is to be used. *The Bird is flown away—They would have flown away—Having flown—Being flown, &c.*

To fly is likewise frequently used, to signify *To flee*; which latter Word is too much neglected. And, since even our best Authors do not scruple to employ it instead of *Flee*, it must be owned to have that Signification; tho' I cannot help thinking it's being used in such a Sense is a Deformity in the Language. When it signifies *To flee*, the preterperfect Tense is *Fled*—*He fled away*: But the Participle present is *Flying*, as when it signifies *To move with Wings*.—*The Army is flying*.

With the Auxiliaries *Fled* is to be used.—*They are fled--He had fled--Having fled-Being fled-&c.*

As to the Verb *To flee*, the preterperfect Tense is here likewise *Fled*, which is also to be used with the Auxiliaries. For Instance, *We fled away—They are fled—They would have fled—Having fled—Being fled—&c.*

The preterperfect of *Flow* is *Flowed*—*The Tide flowed with a strong Current*. *Flowed* is likewise to be used with the Auxiliaries—*Has flow'd—Having flow'd—&c.*

Many

Many People use *Flown* with the Auxiliaries, and would say *The River has flown but weakly of late*. But this is not English. Neither is the Word *Overflowed* to be admitted, though very frequently used. The proper Word is *Overflowed*—*The River has overflowed it's Banks—The Grounds are overflowed*.

XXX. C A M E.

THIS Word, which is the Preterperfect of *Come*, is used by some Writers now living with the auxiliary Verbs. Instead of saying, *He is come, He would have come*, they would say *He is Came, He would have Came*. But this is not English. Because, forsooth, in the Generality of our Verbs the Word used in the preterperfect Tense is the same with that used with the Auxiliaries, they will have it to be so likewise in this Instance. But the Verb *To come* is an Exception to this Rule, as is also the Verb *To go*, which has been mentioned already.

If these Writers persist in this Use of the Word *Came*, I would advise them, not to be inconsistent with themselves, to employ the Word *Went* likewise.

wife with the Auxiliaries, and to say *He has went*—*He had went*—*They are went*—and, instead of *The Bird is flown*, *The Bird is flew*. In short, so many of our Verbs are Exceptions to the Rule above-mentioned that, if we should bring them all to conform to it, we should have a new Language.

XXXI. *To S E W. To S O W.*

THE first of these (which signifies *To stitch with Needle and Thread*) is a regular Verb, the Preterperfect being *Sewed*, and the same Word being used with the Auxiliaries.—*She has sew'd it*—*It is well sew'd*.

But *To sow* (*To scatter Corn or Seed upon ploughed or otherwise prepared Ground*) is irregular, in that either *Sowed* or *Sown* is used with the Auxiliaries; the last of which two Words is the most frequently employed. *He has sown his Corn*—*The Corn is sown*.

And yet I know not whether, in speaking of *the Ground*, I should not prefer *Sowed*, and rather say *The Ground is sow'd* than *The Ground is sown*. However, I don't insist upon it that this Expression is the best.

XXXII.

XXXII. *To S E T. To S I T.*

TH ESE two Verbs are continually confounded in more than one Tense, and give Occasion to innumerable Instances of false English. Even People of very good Education mis-employ them.

The first of them, which has several different Significations, does not change in any of the Tenses, let the Signification of the Word be what it will. We say, *What Time do you set out?* — *He set out yesterday for Bath*—*I shall set somebody to watch them.*

Set is likewise used with the Auxiliaries. *A Dog was set at me*—*He is now set about it in good Earnest*—*He has set down his Load*—*I ought to have set the Trees some Time ago*—*They being so violently sat against each other, there is no Probability of a Reconciliation.*

As to the Verb *To sit*, it's Preterperfect is *Sat*, which is also used with the Auxiliaries. *He sat down*—*When we had sat there some Time, we removed*—*Having sat with us about an Hour, they left us.*

This

This Verb is sometimes used not as a Neuter, but as a Verb active, with an accusative Case following it. *I'll sit me down—She sat her down—They sat themselves down.*

But it is to be observed that the Verb is active and governs an Accusative only when we speak of Persons seating *themselves*, and not in mentioning their causing *others* to sit. Therefore such Expressions as these—*I'll sit you down—He sat her down—They sat us down*—are not proper.

To Seat is a regular Verb. *Seated*, which is the Preterperfect, is used with the Auxiliaries. *He seated himself—When we had seated ourselves—She was seated—They being seated.*

XXXIII. *To L I E. To L A Y.*

THESE two Verbs are as often confounded as *Set* and *Sit*; of which the Occasion, in a great Measure, may be that the Word *Lay* happens to be the preterperfect Tense of the Verb *To Lie*.

To Lay is a regular Verb. Its Preterperfect is *Laid*. This is likewise the Word used with

E the

the Auxiliaries. For Instance, *He laid the Money down—He laid about him lustily—We laid no Strefs upon that—I have laid a Wager—They had laid out all their Money—The Wind is laid—The Things are laid in Order—Having laid the Burden upon the Horse—The Case being laid before him.*

The Preterperfect of the Verb *To Lie* is *Lay*; and the Word used with the Auxiliaries is *Lain*. For Example. *I was Lazy this Morning, and lay long a-bed—They went yesterday for Bath, and lay at Reading.—I was lately at his Country-house, where I lay two Nights—I have lain in this Bed above a dozen Years—The House has lain in Ruins for a considerable Time—She was taken ill; but, having lain down for about an Hour, she found herself well.*

To Lie, when it signifies *To tell Lies*, is a regular Verb. The Preterperfect is *Lied*, which is the Word used with the Auxiliaries. *He lied egregiously—He has always lied from his Cradle.*

XXXIV. O V E R L A I N.

THERE is such a Word as this: But it is for the most Part improperly employed.
The

The Child is overlain, says one. *The Nurse has overlain the Child*. This is not good English : For *Overlain* belongs to the Verb *Overlie*, not to the Verb *Overlay* : And yet *Overlay* is the Verb used where Mention is made of a Nurse's pressing and smothering a Child. Now the Participle passive of *Overlay*, and the Word used with the Auxiliaries, is *Overlaid*, and not *Overlain*.

The proper Way of speaking therefore is this. *I am afraid she'll overlay the Child—The Nurse has overlaid the Child—The Child is overlaid*.

And yet I cannot help suspecting that, if the Expression was invented by reasonable People, *Overlie*, and not *Overlay*, was the Word originally used in speaking of Nurses' smothering Children. A Child being killed by the Nurse's *lying over* it, it seems most natural that the Word should be composed of *Over* and *Lie*, and not of *Over* and *Lay*. But Nurses, and those about them, being commonly very ignorant, and your low ignorant People almost ever using *Lay* for *Lie*, and *Laid* for *Lain*, *Overlay* presently took Place among them, in-

stead of *Overlie*; and, Persons of Sense or Learning being commonly Strangers to the Nursery, and seldom mentioning or thinking about the smothering of Children, the Nurses' Language has universally obtained.

Or shall we rather believe that the Word was *not* invented by reasonable People, but that it was coin'd in the Nursery? This, after all appears the most probable. For there is no Doubt but Words are commonly invented by those, who are fullest of the Ideas intended to be conveyed by them. And whom shall we suppose to think so often of the overlaying Children as Nurses and their Companions? If this be the Case; if the Word was invented in the Nursery, *Overlay* (and not *Overlie*) is most probably, for the Reason mentioned above, (*viz.* the low People's using *Lay* for *Lie*) the original Word.

As to the Verb *Overlie*, it is used where we speak of a Person's continuing in Bed beyond a proper Time. *I am sleepy to-night, and shall overlie my-self in the Morning, if I am not called—I slept beyond my Time, and overlay my-self this Morning—'Tis later than I thought. I find I have overlain my-self.*

XXXV. Our News-writers mentioning their Intelligence from *Oxford* or *Cambridge*, frequently tell us that on such a Day was conferred on such and such Gentlemen the Degree of *Doctors of Divinity*.

THIS Expression is wrong. They ought to say *The Degree of Doctor of Divinity*.

In like Manner, though we say very properly, *The King has made (or created) those two Gentlemen Baronets*, it would not be right to say *The King has conferred the Dignity of Baronets on them*. The proper Expression is *The King has conferred the Dignity of Baronet on them*.

So likewise, in speaking of *one Man*, who has received the Honour, though we say *He is made (or created) a Baronet*, we ought not to say *The Dignity of a Baronet is conferred on him*, but *The Dignity of Baronet is conferred on him*, omitting the Word *a*.

The same Rule is to be observed in speaking of any other Title, or of any Post. *The King has conferred on them the Title of Duke—*
The King has conferred on him the Title of Duke—



Duke—Those two Counsellors were both raised to the Post of Attorney General—He was raised to the post of Attorney General. These are the proper Expressions; and the following ones are improper. The King has conferred on them the Title of Dukes—The King has conferred on him the Title of a Duke.—Those two Counsellors were both raised to the Post of Attorney-Generals.—He was raised to the Post of the (or of an) Attorney-General.

XXXVI. *Up, Down, Above, Below.*

TO go (or come) *up stairs. To go (or come) down stairs*, are proper Expressions.

To go (or come) above stairs, To go (or come) below stairs, though frequently used, are not strictly proper.

On the other Hand, *To be above-stairs—To be below-stairs*, are proper.

To be up stairs, To be down stairs, are improper; unless the *Being up or down* imply the *Getting up or down*. As, for Instance—a Man says *I called him down stairs, and he was down in an Instant*. There is Nothing improper in this, because *He was down* is equivalent to *He got down Stairs*, or in other Words, to *He arrived below-stairs*, and therefore does not imply his abiding there.

Neither

Neither are these two Words, *Got* and *Arrived*, (which I have made use of to explain the Matter) to be employed indiscriminately with *Up*, *Down*, *above* or *Below Stairs*.

To get is to be used with *Up* or *Down*; and *To arrive* with *Above* and *Below*. Suppose I see a very gouty Man a long Time in going down a Stair-case. I say, upon his landing, *At length, after much hobbling, he is got down stairs*, or *At length, after much hobbling, he is arrived below stairs*. *Got below stairs*, in the Sense here intended, would be uncouth; and *Arrived down stairs* would be still more so.

Yet in another Sense *Got above* or *below stairs* would be proper. If a Man has lived formerly upon a Ground-floor, but lives now over-head, I say, very properly, *He is now got above stairs*, because here my Meaning is that he is *abiding* or *continuing* there: Whereas, agreeably to what has been already observed, if I send a Servant to an upper Apartment, as soon as he has mounted the top-most Step of the Stair-case, I ought to say *He is got up stairs*. If I should say *He is got above stairs*, I should talk bad English.

We

We have other Words, which, used with *Up* or *Down*, have a different Sense from what they have, when used with *Above* or *Below*. It would be too tedious to produce them all, and I shall mention only the Word *Dispatch*. If I say *I'll dispatch my Servant up-stairs*, It means that I will send him up; whereas, if I say *I'll dispatch him above stairs*, the meaning is that I will dispatch him when I am above.

These Distinctions have Nothing finical or affected in them. Most People make them mechanically: and such as confound the Words in Question (which even Persons of Education are apt to do in some of our remote Counties) cannot be said to talk good English.

XXXVII. IMMINENT. EMINENT.

MANY of our Writers use the latter of these two Words with the Substantive *Danger*, and, instead of *An imminent*, say *An eminent Danger*; than which surely there cannot be a greater Absurdity. Can there be a more just Expression than *An imminent Danger*? which signifies a Danger where the Evil threatened is at Hand. But what is a *noted* or *illustrious*

erious Danger? for this is the Meaning of the Expression they use.

This Mis-application of the Word *Eminent* took it's Rise in all Probability from an Itch of imitating the French. They have in their Language the three Words *Imminent*, *Eminent*, and *Danger*; which, as they are spelt in the same Manner as in the English, have likewise the same Significations. Now so it has happen'd (whatever the Cause may have been) that this Expression of *An eminent Danger* has introduced itself among *them*. It is of long Standing; and so universal is it become, that a Frenchman cannot now talk of an *imminent* Danger without speaking uncouthly. This is a considerable Blemish in their Tongue; and their Writers, who are sensible of the Inconvenience, are often reduced to this Dilemma when they mention an impending Danger, viz; either to talk Nonsense, or to make use of an Expression that appears stiff. And shall *we*, from a fondness of imitating that Nation, introduce into our Language a Way of speaking which they themselves own to be a Deformity in their's, and which their Writers would be glad to banish?

The Impropriety, if it should take Place here, would be more unpardonable than it was in *France*. In all Probability, it began there among the ignorant, who always make the Bulk of a Nation, and was not adopted by the learned (some of whom even to this Day persist in the use of the Word *Imminent*) till it was become almost general; whereas the People, who have begun it among *us*, are *Writers*, Men whose Duty it is to endeavour to polish a Language, and consequently to discountenance all barbarous Expressions.

XXXVIII. PURPOSE. PROPOSE.

TO *propose* signifies *To make an Offer*, or *a proposal of*. *To purpose* signifies *To intend*, *To design*. How different are these two Senses! and how wrong is it then to make so little Use as we do of the Verb *To purpose*, and so often to employ *To propose* in it's Stead! This is the more injudicious as, notwithstanding the Difference there is between *To make a proposal* and *To intend*, there are many Places where the Word *Propose* might be understood to mean either the one or the other, and consequently
where

where the Speaker or Writer would be liable to be mis-apprehended, as has been already remarked in Regard to the Word *Ingenuity*, which is employed to signify either *Candour* or *Ability*. Why don't we likewise neglect the Substantive *Purpose*, and employ *Proposal* in the Room of it? for I can't see why the Substantive should have better Quarter than the Verb.

Is the giving this wrong Sense to the Verb *Propose* in Imitation of the French, as I have suspected the Use of the Expression *Eminent Danger* to be? If so, the Introducers of it have not hit the Mark: for, though it can't be affirmed that the Word *Proposer*, which signifies *To make a proposal of*, does not likewise signify *to intend*, yet it is now seldom used in this latter Sense: and a Frenchman would rather say *Il se propose de faire cela* than *Il propose de faire cela*; which latter Expression would be equivocal, the most obvious Meaning of these Words being *He makes a Proposal of doing that*, which would not be the Sense of the Speaker; whereas the Words *Il se propose de faire cela* (verbatim, in English, *He proposes to himself to do that*) have but one Meaning, and cannot be mis-understood. And in all

Probability the French accompany the Word *Propofer* with *se*, in order to avoid the double Sense it would otherwise have ; whereas we, on the contrary, foolishly reject a Word of single Sense, and to which there can be no reasonable Exception, and supply it's Place with an ambiguous one ; as if there were a Beauty in Ambiguity, a Thing which tends to defeat the very Intention of Language—the Communication of Thoughts.

I can assign no other Cause than this Inclination to imitate the French for the Habit some Writers now living have got of using the Verb *To lay* instead of *To lie* ; which I have already observed to be a common Vice in speaking, though few have been hitherto guilty of it in Print. The French Word *Coucher* is both active and Neuter, and signifies *To lay*, and also *To lie*. Upon this Account (as I have here hinted) I suspect it is that these Writers never employ the Verb *To lie*, which I therefore suppose they would banish out of our Language. *The French make shift with one Verb. And why should not we ?* Most admirable reasoning, truly ! As if the having different Words for different Meanings were not a Perfection in a Language,

age, and the Want of them a Defect. A reasonable Man, if he were not a Witness of it, would hardly conceive there could be such an Instance of Want of Judgment.

This Propensity to adopt French Customs puts me in Mind of the following Circumstance, which I have often hear'd affirmed as a certain Fact.

Though the French have in general strong and good Hair, and are not so subject to Baldness as we are, it so happened about the Year 1734 that the Hair of many People of both Sexes at *Paris* fell off: in Consequence of which, they wore Wigs. Thereupon Numbers of Women in *England*, hearing of what had been done at *Paris*, cut off good Heads-of-Hair and wore Wigs likewise; to which those French-women had had Recourse only to conceal a Deformity.

I would not be understood, from any Thing I have here said, to advise the avoiding French Customs. I would only dissuade from the adopting them meerly as French. Let us imitate that or any other Nation in what is in itself right; but not run into absurd Habits

bits because those Habits had their Birth in this or that Place. We have already improved our Language not a little by Expressions taken from the French, and may improve it still more by the same Means. But, at the same Time, let us endeavour to discern wherein we have the Advantage, and where that Nation ought rather to copy us than we them.

XXXIX. *W H O M.*

WE often find this Word in bad Writers, and sometimes even in good ones, in the Room of *Who*.

Mr. Locke says, in one of his Letters to Mr. *Molyneux*, *If you were here, you would find three or four in the Parlour after Dinner, whom you would say passed their Afternoons as agreeably and as jocosely as any People you have this good while met with.*

This is not good English. He ought to have said *Who* you would say passed their Afternoons, &c. and not *Whom*: for the Pronoun is not in the accusative Case and governed by the Verb *Say*: but it is the Nominative to the Verb *Passed*

Passed: and *Whom* is not a Nominative. If the small Hiatus there would have been in *Who* you was the Reason of his avoiding those Words, he might have given another Turn to the Sentence, and have writ *Of whom you would say that they passed their Afternoons*, or *Whom you would own to pass their Afternoons*, &c.

In Poetry, where greater Liberties in Point of stile may be taken than in Prose, *Whom* may, for the sake of Sound, be used instead of *Who*, especially if so placed as for the false Grammar not to be too glaring; which *Pope* has very well observed in the *Dunciad*, where he speaks of *Fleet-Ditch* in the following Manner;

*The King of Dikes, than whom no sluice of Mud
With deeper Sable blots the silver Flood.*

To have written strictly good English, he must have said *Than who no sluice of Mud*, since the Word is in the same Case with *Sluice*, which is a Nominative. But, as there is a Force in the Word *Whom* which there is not in *Who*, the using this last Word would have enfeebled the Sentence, and in a great Measure have spoil'd two of the most beautiful Lines in English Poetry.

There

There are likewise Places, even in Prose, where for the sake of Sound, *Whom* may be used in the Nominative.

XL. *Him. Her. Me. Them.*

THESE Pronouns are frequently used in the nominative Case even among the better Sort of People. 'Tis *him*.—'Tis *her*.—'Tis *me*.—'Tis *them*. This is bad English. *He, She, I, and They*, are the proper Words.

We have few Writers who are more seldom guilty of false English than *Congreve*, or who have written in so elegant a Style. Yet in his *Way of the World* he has used the Word *Me* improperly.

Millamant. “ What was the Quarrel ?

Petulant. “ There was no Quarrel. There
“ might have been a Quarrel.

Witwoud. “ If there had been Words enow
“ to have expressed Provocation,
“ they had gone together by the
“ Ears like a pair of Castanets,

Petulant. “ You were the Quarrel,

Millamant. “ *Me !*

This

This is wrong. She ought to have said *I*.

Yet it must be owned there are some Places where the Nominative is required, and where the Word *I*, as having too thin and unsubstantial a Sound, would not do.

There is an Instance of this in the same Play, where *My Lady Wishfort* says to *Mrs. Fainall*,
 “ O Daughter, Daughter, is it possible thou
 “ should’st be my Child, Bone of my Bone,
 “ and Flesh of my Flesh, and (as I may say)
 “ another *Me*, and yet transgress the minutest
 “ Particle of severe Virtue? ” Here the Word *I*, though correct English, would be awkward, and *Me*, though not grammatical, does better. The Word *Myself* might indeed have been used. Being a Nominative, it would have been grammar: and I think I should have preferred it to *Me*. Nor are there many Places where the Word *I*, when the Sound of it would be too poor, might not be substituted by *My-self*.

Some inferior Writers seem to think they shew an extraordinary Correctness by using an accusative Case where a Verb active follows, as supposing it to be governed by that Verb. For Example, instead of *It was not he they attacked.*—*It was not we they slandered.*—they

G

would

would say *It was not him they attacked—It was not us they slandered*—imagining *Him* and *Us* to be Accusatives governed respectively by the Verbs *Attacked* and *Slandered*. But they write false English. These Pronouns ought to be in the nominative Case, as following the Verb *Was*. There is indeed an Accusative, (viz: *Whom*, or *That*) governed by *Attacked* and *slandered*. But this Accusative is supposed, The regular Way of speaking being this—*It was not he, whom (or that) they attacked—It was not we, whom (or that) they slandered*.

XLI. P U L S E.

PULSE, as signifying the Pulsation of the Blood, is improperly used by many People as a Plural. Instead of *How does your Pulse beat?—Your Pulse is too quick.*—they would say *How do your Pulse beat?—Your Pulse are too quick.* They are deceived by the Letter *S*, which being the last Letter that is pronounced, they from thence take the Word to be in the plural Number. But this Word is singular; and the Plural is *Pulses*.—*The Pulses of two or more Persons—The different Pulses of the Wrists, Temples, and other Parts of the Body.*

In speaking of such Vegetables as are called *Pulse*, we say *Pulse of different Sorts*, or *Different Sorts of Pulse*; and not *Different Pulses*, nor *Different Sorts of Pulses*: so that this Word has no Plural.

XLII. *Neither read nor write.*

THIS is the common Way of speaking; but it is certainly wrong, it being much more proper to say *He can neither write nor read*, than *He can neither read nor write*. To what Purpose is it to say that a Man can not write, after having said that he cannot read? for, if he can not read, it follows of Course that he can not write.

It being, for the Reason here given, better to say *He can neither write nor read* than *He can neither read nor write*, it is consequently better to say *He can both read and write* than *He can both write and read*, since, if a Man can write, we must necessarily suppose that he can read.

XLIII. *M U T U A L.*

THIS Word is often improperly employed. It ought to be used only when we would signify that there is an Interchange. If a Man and a Woman have a Love for each other, there is a *Mutual* Love between them. If two Men have a Friendship each for the other, their Friendship is *mutual*. But let us suppose A to be a Benefactor to B and likewise to C: it would be absurd in B, speaking to C concerning A, to say *Our mutual Benefactor*. The proper Expression would be *Our common Benefactor*. A King is the *common* Sovereign, not the *mutual* Sovereign, of his several Subjects: for there is here no Reciprocation, or Interchange, that justifies the use of the Word *Mutual*. And yet many of our writers employ *Mutual* in Cases similar to these. But our most judicious Writers take Care to avoid it. Mr. *Locke*, in a Letter to Dr. *Molyneux*, speaking of the Doctor's Brother, then lately dead, says very properly *The Esteem I have for the Memory of our common Friend*. Had he said *Our mutual Friend*, he had not talked Sense: for, though there had subsisted a mutual Friendship between

. Mr *Locke*

Locke & the deceased, and the same likewise between the two Brothers, yet there is Nothing of Interchange between *Mr Locke* and the surviving Brother implied in the Circumstance of the Friendship there had been between the deceased and each of *them* separately.

XLIV. L E F T O F F.

WE see continually in our News-Papers Advertisements written in the following Manner.

To be Sold—The Stock of Mr. ———, left off Trade——The Goods of such-a-one, left off House-keeping.

This is Nonsense, the Words *left off*, whether they are considered as a Verb or as a Participle, having here no Substantive, with which they are connected.

These Advertisers, instead of *left off*, ought to say either *leaving off*, or *who has left off*. For Instance, *The Stock of Mr A, leaving off Trade. The Goods of Mrs B, leaving off House-keeping. The Stock of Mr A, who has left off Trade,—— The Goods of Mrs B, who has left off Housekeeping.*
 XLV.

 XLV. UNDENIABLE.

WE likewise often see in the News-papers Advertisements for Places by People, who tell the Public their Characters are *Undeniable*.

This Word, as they use it, is not Sense. If I draw a Character of a Man, and afterwards affirm the Character I have given him to be undeniable, this is a proper Way of speaking, and signifies that I have delivered Nothing but Truth. But the Meaning of these People is that their Characters are such as no reasonable Exception can be made to. They ought therefore to say that their Characters are (not *undeniable*, but) *unexceptionable*.

XLVI. NEITHER. EITHER.

WE have numberless Writers, who make these Adjectives plural where they ought to make them singular.

*Is either of those two Men a Relation of your's?—
No, neither of them is. This is the proper Way
of*

of speaking, and not (as some would say) *Are either of those two Men Relations of your's ?—No, neither of them are.*

Here *either* is equivalent to *any one* or *ever a one*, and *neither* to *no one* or *never a one*.

But, when these Adjectives refer to Substantives plural, they become plural themselves: as, for Instance—*The French and the English give strange Accounts of one another. Are either of them impartial ? No neither of them are.*

Where they refer to two Substantives, one singular, and the other plural, it seems most natural to make them plural.

XLVII. L E S S.

THIS Word is most commonly used in speaking of a Number; where I should think *Fewer* would do better. *No fewer than a Hundred* appears to me not only more elegant than *No less than a Hundred*, but more strictly proper.

 XLVIII. CONTEMPTUOUSLY.

Contemptuously, to signify *with Contempt*, is a better Word than *Contemptibly*, though this last is most commonly used. If I hear it said that one Man treats another contemptibly, I hardly know whether the Meaning is that he treats him with Contempt, or that his own Behaviour is contemptible.

 XLIX. *Possessed of. Possessed by.*

A Man that knows how to mingle Pleasures with Business, says some Author, (and I think it is my Lord Bolingbroke) *is never possessed of them. He quits and retakes them at his Will.*

Possessed of them is here wrong. The proper Expression would have been *Possessed by them*. If I possess a Thing, I am possessed of it. If it possesses me, I am possessed by it.

L. *'Tis so many to one but, &c.*

'TIS twenty to one but (or but that) it will happen—'Tis ten to one but (or but that) he will be displeased.

This

This is a common way of speaking, though in my Opinion a very absurd one. What has the Word *but* to do here? It has certainly no Meaning. Is it not therefore more elegant and more natural to leave it out and to say—'*Tis twenty to one it will happen, or that it will happen—'Tis ten to one he will be displeased, or that he will be displeased?*

LI. T O P R O F I T O F.

MY Lord Bolingbroke seems fond of this Expression.

We say, *to take Advantage of this or that Circumstance, or to make an Advantage by it, or to profit by it.*

To profit of I conceive not to be English.

LII. **T**Hough I don't allow *to profit of* to be English, *to make profit of* is, without Doubt, a very proper Expression.

They found Mankind immersed in Superstition and accustomed to Licentiousness. To cure them of the latter, they made their Profit of the former,
 Lord Bolingbroke.

LIII. **W**E find in many Authors (and, among others, in *Swift*) the Expression of *The Manner of it is thus*.

The Word *thus* signifies *in this Manner*. It should seem therefore as though *The Manner of it is thus* were as much as to say *The Manner of it is in this Manner*; which is Nonsense.

It is better to say *The Manner of it is this*.

LIV. P R E S S E N T I M E N T.

THIS French Word is wrongly translated by some of our Writers *Pre-sentiment*, for *Pre-sentiment* has no Meaning.

It ought to be translated (as it is by some few) *Pre-sensation*; which Word would be very useful in our Language, and ought therefore to be adopted.

The French Word does not signify a *Fore-Knowledge*, but an unaccountable *Fore-feeling* of what will happen.

LV. HUES and CRIES.

SOME Writers use this Expression, and would say *There were several Hues and Cries after him.*

This seems to be wrong, and I should think it better to say *Hue-and-Cries*; for in the singular Number we do not say *a Hue and a Cry*, but *a Hue-and-Cry*, making one Word of three: for which Reason, and likewise because it is seldom used, *Hues and Cries* sounds uncouthly.

LVI. F E L L.

THIS Word is used by almost all incorrect Speakers, & even by many Writers, instead of *Fallen*.--*The Horse has fell*.--*The House is fell*.

This is not good *English*. The proper Word (as here hinted) is *Fallen*.

LVII. WORN. TORN.

THESE Words are better with the Auxiliaries than *Wore* and *Tore*.--*These Cloaths are but little worn*.--*He has worn this Suit for some Time*.--*He has torn the Writings*.--*The Writings are torn*.

LVIII. COMPUTED TO.

THE Rents of Land in Ireland may be computed to Two Millions. Swift.

Computed at would have been the proper Expression. *To compute to* I look upon not to be English.

LIX. **M**ANY Writers say *to wreck Malice*; and the Expression occurs several Times in Swift.

To wreck Malice is the proper Expression; *to wreck* signifying *to discharge*.

LX. *Instant. Instantaneous.*

SOME Writers confound these two Adjectives, and likewise the Adverbs *instantly* and *instantaneously*, making them respectively synonymous. Others distinguish them, and make *Instant* to signify *Immediate, Just at Hand*, and *Instantaneous* to imply *Of no Duration*. For Example; *His Coming is instant—He will be here instantly—A Flash of Lightning is instantaneous—A Flash of Lightning exists but instantaneously.*

It is best to make the Distinction. Different Meanings ought undoubtedly to be expressed in different Words; without which, the Intention of Language is not answered. *Both*

LXI. B O T H.

THIS Word is often introduced in an absurd Manner.

The Goddess Minerva had heard of one Arachne, a young Virgin very famous for spinning and weaving. They both met upon a Trial of Skill.

SWIFT.

What does he mean by saying *they both met*? The Word *both* is superfluous, and seems to make Nonsense. One would imagine the Author thought there was a Possibility that in the Interview between them, one of them could meet without the other's meeting. If two People come together, they must *both* come together, of course. It be would ridiculous to say *There is a Contest betwien both of those two Men*: for, if two Men are engaged in a Contest, they must necessarily be *both* engaged in that Contest.

It must be owned, however, that this Word sometimes gives a seemingly-wanted Force to an Expression, where the Sense is compleat without it: and *there* it is to be not only borne with, but approved. But in the Passage above cited, and in numberless others where we meet with it, it is impertinent.

LXII. *In*

LXII. *In Comparison of.*

THIS is an Expression used by many of our Writers, and, among others, by Lord Bolingbroke, in whom it is very frequent.

In Comparison with seems to me to be preferable.

This is very good in Comparison of that—This is very good in Comparison with that. Is not the latter plainly the better Expression of the two? and does it not make the best Sense?

LXIII. **F**AINALL says to Mirabel in *The Way-of the World*, Now I recollect, I wonder not they were weary of you. Last Night was one of their Cabal Nights. They have them three Times a Week, and meet at each other's Apartments, like the Coroner's Inquest, to sit upon the murdered Reputations of the Week. You and I are excluded: and it was once proposed that all the Male Sex should be excepted. But Somebody moved that, to avoid Scandal, there might be one Man of the Community: upon which, Witwoud and Petulant were enroll'd Members.

Were enroll'd a Member would have been a more proper Expression. Let us suppose that
this

this Society had admitted Men among them. Each Man would have been look'd upon not as *two* Members, but as *one* only. Consequently, having mentioned *Witwoud* and *Petulant's* being admitted, as making jointly but *one* Man, there is an Inconsistency in his calling them *two* Members, and he ought to have said they were enrolled *a Member*: by which Expression likewise the Humour would have been kept up.

LXIV. MUSSULMEN.

THIS Word is used by many Writers as the Plural of *Mussulman*; which is wrong. 'Tis true we say *Frenchmen*, *Dutchmen*, *Irishmen*, &c. and not *Frenchmans*, *Dutchmans*, *Irishmans*, because *Frenchman*, *Dutchman*, *Irishman*, are composed respectively of *French* and *Man*, *Dutch* and *Man*, *Irish* and *Man*, and because *Men* is the Plural of *Man*. But, as to the Word *Mussulman*, though it may be a Compound in the Arabic, (where, we are told, it signifies *a Believer* in the true Religion) yet, considered as an English Word, it is not compounded, but simple: for we have no such Word as *Mussul* in the English Tongue.

It

It is the same with the Substantives *Ottoman* and *German*, which, considered as English Words, are not compounded, whatever they may have been in the Countries where they were coined. Accordingly, we say *Ottomans* and *Germans* in the Plural: and no one ever yet took it into his Head to say *Ottomen* or *Germen*.

We ought, in like Manner, to say *Mussulmans* in the Plural, and not *Mussulmen*, the Use of which Word shews a want of Judgment.

LXV. *HE* is more a Soldier than a Scholar. This is an Expression, to which I imagine no Exception will be made. But, as to the following, *He is a better Soldier than a Scholar*, though perhaps not one in a great many would find Fault with it, it seems to me not perfectly to make Sense. As the Word *better* intervenes between *a* and *Soldier*, I should think it best to leave out the *a* that precedes *Scholar*, and to say *He is a better Soldier than Scholar*.

LXVI. Agree-

LXVI. *Agreeable, Suitable, Conformable, Consistent.*

THESE Adjectives, with others much to the same Purpose, are used improperly by the greatest Part of our Writers; for they frequently employ them as Adverbs.

His Performance was agreeable to his Promise—His Conduct was suitable to the Occasion—this makes Sense.

He performed agreeably to his Promise—He conducted himself suitably to the Occasion—this likewise makes Sense.

But—He performed agreeable to his Promise—He conducted himself suitable to the Occasion—this is Nonsense.

The Word *Previous* likewise ought to be us'd only as an Adjective, and never as an Adverb, *He wrote to me previous to his coming to Town* is not good English.

The proper Expression is *He wrote to me previously to his coming to Town.*

Some Writers employ the Word *bad* as an Adverb, and would not scruple to say *That was done very bad* : which is not English.

The Word *ill* (it is true) is both an Adjective and an Adverb : but *bad* is only an Adjective. The Adverb is *badly*.

LXVII. **T**HE Word *safely* is likewise (as I apprehend) improperly used by some Authors.

I arrived here safely the 15th Instant, says Mr *Molyneux* in a Letter to Mr *Locke*.

This appears to me hardly to make Sense. *Safely* signifies *with safety*, or *in a safe Manner*. Now, if a Man says that he arrived in a safe Manner, he seems to suppose there is Danger of some Mischance in arriving. But what Danger is there to be apprehended in the Circumstance of arriving ? The Danger is only during the Journey or Voyage. In the Arrival there is none at all. The proper Way of speaking is therefore *I arrived safe*, that is *having escaped all the Dangers of the Passage*.

Government

LXVIII. *Government. Administration.*

OUR News-writers have lately taken it into their Heads to personify (as it were) our Government by using the Words *Government* and *Administration* in the following Manner. *The Disputes between Government (not the Government) and the East-India Company.—Administration (not the Administration) seems at a Loss how to proceed in this Business.*

This is an Expression of great Barbarity.

LIX. *THIS produced such melancholy Thoughts in me, says an Author, that if they had continued, might have proved fatal to my Health.*

Such that, where the Word *that* is a Pronoun, as it is here, makes bad English.

He might have said either, *Such melancholy Thoughts as, if they had continued, might have proved fatal to my Health.* or, *Such melancholy Thoughts that, if they had continued, they might have proved fatal to my Health..—Here the Word that is an Adverb.*

LXX. **H**ERE, says another Author, *are so many Characters, that the Person of the Emperor cannot well be mistaken, since not one of them agree with any but Augustus Cæsar.*

We have many Writers, who take this Liberty of using a Verb plural with a nominative Case singular, where a genitive Case plural intervenes between them.

There is no Grace in this ; and it is a needless and a very ridiculous Violation of Grammar. The Verb here being in the Indicative, not in the Subjunctive Mood, (for in the third Person singular of the present Tense of the Subjunctive Mood our Verbs have no s) the proper Expression is *Not one of them agrees with any but Augustus Cæsar.*

LXXI. **H**E printed a great Number of Authors, says the same Writer, *in such a Manner as shew him to have been a very ingenious and learned Man.*

Here is an Absurdity nearly a-kin to that just mentioned. It is not the Word *Authors*,
but

but the Word *Manner*, that ought to determine the Number of the Verb, The proper Way of speaking therefore is *in such a Manner as shews him to have been a very ingenious and learned Man.*

LXXII. **I**T is customary at the Playhouse, at the Conclusion of *The Beggar's Opera*, if the same be intended to be acted again the next Night, for one of the Actors to advance and say *To-morrow will be performed this Opera again.*

He ought to say *this Comedy*, not *this Opera* : for, though *The Beggar's Opera* be the Name of the Piece, it is not an Opera. It is a Comedy written partly in ridicule of Operas. How absurd would it be to speak of the dramatic Piece called *The Tragedy of Tom Thumb* as of a real Tragedy ! It is not a Tragedy, though the Word *Tragedy* make Part of its Name. The Piece is comic. It is a Farce written in ridicule of modern Tragedy.

Swift speaks very properly of *The Beggar's Opera* at the Beginning of the 3d Intelligencer, where he says, *The Players having now almost*
done

done with the Comedy called THE BEGGAR'S OPERA for the Season, &c.

LXXIII. *An improper Repetition of the Adverb* T H A T.

I Expected that, when I told him the News, that he would be more surprized at it than he really was.

This is Nonfense; and its being so is owing to the Adverb's being twice used in the mention of one Circumstance. The proper Way of speaking is, *I expected that, when I told him the News, he would be more surprized at it than he really was.*

The Repetition of the Adverb is allowable only where, after once using it, so many Words intervene before the Circumstance is mentioned, to which it belongs, that it may be supposed the Reader or Hearer has so far forgot it, as not readily to perceive the Connexion; in which Case it is to be introduced the second Time with the Words that preceded it before; as, for Instance,

*I was in Hopes that, as he had always expressed
a great*

a great Friendship for this now distressed Family, as he is likewise immensely rich, and never was looked upon as a Man of a near Disposition, but (on the contrary) of a very liberal and compassionate one, of which he has given numberless Proofs (for seldom a Week has past but he has relieved some indigent Person) I say I was in hopes, considering all this, that he would give the unfortunate Family a very ample Assistance.

LXXIV. **A** Very great Absurdity, of which both the English and the French are continually guilty as well in writing as in speaking, is the making the Pronoun relative *that* (or *which*, or *who*) singular, where it refers to a Substantive Plural, and where consequently it ought itself to be Plural.

Example. *He was one of those Highwaymen, that was condemned last Sessions.*

This is false Grammar, if the Meaning be that several Highwaymen were condemned last Sessions, and that this Man was one of them: for in that Case the Pronoun relative *that* refers to *Highwaymen*, not to *he*, and we ought therefore, to say, *He was one of those Highwaymen that WERE condemned last Sessions.* A Transposi-
But

tion of the Words will make it plain that the Word *that* refers to *Highwaymen*. For Instance, *Of those Highwaymen that were condemned last Sessions, he was one.*

But the Expression, if taken in another Sense, is good Grammar.

Suppose a Company to be talking of a Gang of Highwaymen, and that one of this Company has a Mind to say that a certain Highwayman, condemned last Sessions, belonged to that Gang; here this Person may say *He was one of those Highwaymen, that was condemned last Sessions*, because the Word *that* refers upon this Occasion not to *Highwaymen*, but to *he*; and the Meaning is, *He, that was condemned last Sessions, was one of those Highwaymen.* But this last Way of speaking, *viz. He, that was condemned last Sessions, was one of those Highwaymen*, is the best, because it is impossible to be misunderstood.

One would think these Distinctions very easy to make. And yet there are few Authors, either English or French, that make them: and it is amazing to see what Blunders and false Grammar many even of the best Writers of the two Nations are herein guilty of.

LXXV. *No other besides.*—*No other except.*—
No other but.

TH E S E Expressions are frequently made use of, where they dont make the Sense intended.

If I ask a Friend what Visits he has received to-day, and he would signify that Mr. *A.* is the only Person that has visited him, he may say *No Person besides Mr A. has visited me, or No other Person than Mr A, has visited me.* But to say *No other Person, besides Mr A, has visited me,* would be wrong, because it would seem as if Somebody else had been mentioned before the Mention of Mr *A.*

Yet there are Places, where this sort of Expression may be right.

If I say *Mr A and Mr B have called on me to-day; but no other Person has come into my Room, besides my Taylor, (or excepting my Taylor)* herein there is Nothing improper. The Words *no other* have here a Meaning; whereas in the former Instance they have none. They signify *no other Person than Mr A and Mr B:* and the whole of what I say signifies that Mr *A* and Mr *B,* and my Taylor, are the only Persons that have been with me.

In Poetry the Sort of Expression here condemned seems sometimes to give a Force which would otherwise be wanting. When that is the Case, it may be allowed.

LXXVI. W O N D E R E D.

INSTEAD of *Those Things were much wondered at*—*That Circumstance was much wondered at*—many Writers would say *Those Things were much wondered*—*That Circumstance was much wondered*—omitting the *at*. This is not English: for we do not say *to wonder a Thing*, but *to wonder at a Thing*.

Where that which raises the Wonder is mentioned after the Word *wondered*, and that Word is preceded by the unrelative Pronoun *It*, the *at* may (as I apprehend) be either used or omitted.—For Instance, *It was wondered that he should marry so late in Life*—*It was wondered at that he should marry so late in Life*.

LXXVII. R E L A T I V E.

THIS Word is often used adverbially by incorrect Writers.

He

He was interrogated relative to that Circumstance—We discoursed a great while relative to what you have just mentioned.

This is not good English. The proper Expressions are *relatively to*, and *in Relation to*.——
He was interrogated relatively to (or in Relation to) that Circumstance—We discoursed a great while relatively to (or in Relation to) what you have just mentioned.

Relative to is to be used only where there is a Substantive, with which *Relative* (an Adjective) agrees. For instance—*The Hint he gave me was relative to that Affair.*—Here *Relative* is an Adjective agreeing with the Substantive *Hint*; and *To* is a Preposition to the Substantive *Affair*.

LXXVIII. OUR Translators from the French Tongue, where they meet with the Words *Huit jours—Quinze jours*—are apt to render them literally *eight Days—fifteen Days*.

The French say *eight Days* and *fifteen Days*, where an Englishman would say *a Week—a*

Fortnight; for they bring both the first and the last Day into the Account. *Huit jours*,—*Quinze jours*—ought therefore to be translated a *Week*—a *Fortnight*. To use a French Expression in writing English is wrong.

I have often wondered that the ingenious Author of *The Rambler* (who without Doubt is well versed in the French Tongue, and who has a remarkable Fluency and Copiousness of Expression in the English) should tell us that some French Writer asserts there are few People, who know how to take a Walk. I know not what French Writer this is; but his Words, in all Probability, are either *Peu de Gens savent se promener*, or *Peu de Gens savent faire une Promenade*. The Words *se promener*, though they signify what an Englishman calls *taking a Walk*, have a much more extensive Signification than this English Expression. They mean likewise *to go out upon a little Party of Pleasure*, whether on Foot, on Horse-back, or in a Carriage. Sometimes they signify *to go leisurely*. *Nous reviendrons en nous promenant* says Lewis the 14th in a Billet to Madame Maintenon; as much as to say *We will come back without hurrying, and will travel only such a Pace as will make our returning an Amusement to us*.

As

As to the French Writer mentioned by *The Rambler*, I should imagine his Meaning to be that few People are properly qualified to make themselves agreeable in any little Jaunt of Pleasure: Which Observation is very just, there being not one in a great many, who has the Compliableness of Temper, the Chearfulness, and the Talent of making amusing Remarks upon any Thing that falls under the Notice of the Company, which seem to be all necessary in such Jaunts.

LXXIX. **A** Common Fault in our Writers is the making the Pronouns *that* and *which* at the same Time Nominative and Accusative; as, for Instance, *The Venison which I received yesterday out of the Country, and was a Present from a Friend.*

There is a Barbarism in this Expression; and it must hurt every Person that has any Delicacy of Apprehension. It is necessary to repeat the Word *which* before *was*, and to say *The Venison which I received yesterday out of the Country, and which was a Present from a Friend.* In *which* I received the *which* is in the Accusative

tive Case. In *which was a Present* it is in the Nominative.

This Fault is frequent in *Swift*, whose *Stile* is far from being so excellent as it is often asserted to be. In some Parts of his Works it is exceedingly good: but in many others it is flat, low, and shamefully incorrect.

I have often wondered at Grammarians' asserting (as they sometimes do) that Nouns have no Cases in the modern Languages. *The Word CASUS*, say they, *which signifies A CASE*, is derived from *CADERE, TO FALL*. Consequently Nouns, that don't change their Termination, have no Cases. But this is only saying that a Noun, that never varies in it's Termination, never varies in it's Termination.

According to this Account, the Latin Word *Nihil* has no Cases; and the Words *felice* and *felici*, which are both used in what we call the ablative Case singular of *felix* are in reality of different Cases, as well as the Words *bonus*, *bona*, *bonum*, which we say are all in the Nominative.

I would ask these Grammarians upon what Account the Greeks and Romans made their
Nouns

Nouns vary in their Termination. No Doubt it was because they felt that a Noun raised different Ideas in their Minds, according to the Place it occupied. Being placed before a Verb, and governing (as we call it) that Verb, it appeared in a different Light from that, in which it appeared in what we call the Accusative Case, where it is (as we say) governed by it.

If this were their Inducement, (and I don't see what other inducement they could have) it is not the Termination that makes the Case, but it is the View, in which the Word appears, that makes it: and different Terminations were invented to express in some Measure the different Views, in which Nouns shew themselves. I say in *some Measure*; for it would have been endless to invent different Terminations for *all* the different Views, in which a Noun substantive is capable of presenting itself to the Imagination.

Now, considering the Thing in this Light, we must conclude that Nouns have as many Cases in one Language as in another; that it is impossible to say how many Cases, or *Situations*, or *Points of View*, there really are; and
that

that the Difference between the Greek and Latin on the one Hand, and the modern Languages on the other, is only this, viz: that in the former there is an Endeavour to shew those *Points of View* by different Terminations, and in the latter by the Use of Prepositions.

LXXX. *The Reason is because, &c.*

THIS Expression does not make Sense.

The Reason of my desiring to see you was because I wanted to talk with you on such an Affair. — The Reason of his going to live in the Country is because he has bad Health.

This Expression (I say again) is Nonsense; and it amazes me that our Writers don't perceive it. But, in short, they don't; and there are scarce any even of our greatest Authors, that avoid this Way of speaking.

Let us put *by Reason* in the Room of *because*. — *By Reason*, to signify *because*, is indeed a low Expression. However, it is English.

The Reason of my desiring to see you was by Reason

Reason I wanted to talk with you on such an Affair.—The Reason of his going to live in the Country is by Reason he has bad Health.

Can any Thing be more glaring than the Nonsense of this Expression.?

The proper Ways of speaking are, *The Reason of my desiring to see you was that I wanted to talk with you on such an Affair.—The Reason of my desiring to see you was my wanting to talk with you on such an Affair.—The Reason of his going to live in the Country is that he has bad Health.—The Reason of his going to live in the Country is his having bad Health.*

The Reason is on Account of is as bad as The Reason is because.

LXXXI. **H**E was admirably formed for Poetry, and in the Year 1671 he had a fair Opportunity of displaying his Talents in that Way. It was on Occasion of the Prize of Poetry founded by the Members of the French Academy; the Subject of which at this Time was on the suppressing of Duelling by Lewis the 14th.

Biographical Dictionary.

L

To

To say *The Subject of it was on the suppressing of Duelling* is talking as improperly as it would be to say *On the suppressing of Duelling was the Subject of it*. The proper Expression would have been *The Subject of which was the suppressing of Duelling*, without the *on*.

LXXXII. *SUPPOSE I were to say that to every Art there was a System of such various and well-approved Principles.*

Harris, the Author of Hermes.

If all the Objections to Newton's System were answered, if the Facts and Calculations were over and over confirmed, a Disciple of Leibnitz would still maintain that there was no sufficient Reason for Attraction as an essential Property, or as an Attribute of Matter.

Lord Bolingbroke.

This is the common Way of speaking, but in my Opinion not the most rational one.

That to every Art there is a System, and that there is no sufficient Reason for Attraction, would be much better Expressions (as I should imagine)

gine) than to every *Art* there was a *System*, and there was no sufficient Reason for *Attraction*.

Tis true the Word *were* in *suppose* I *were* to say, and in *if all the Objections were answered*, is in what we call the preterimperfect Tense of the subjunctive Mood; for which Reason many will say the Verb in the Indicative, which follows, ought to be in the Preterimperfect likewise. But though this Word be in that Tense, yet, in regard to its Sense, it has nothing to do with the Time past: and therefore the following it with a Verb in the Preterimperfect in the *Indicative*, which *does* regard the Time past, is improper, notwithstanding its being the common Way of speaking.

If an Atheist would well consider the Arguments in this Book, he would confess there was a God.— If an Atheist would well consider the Arguments in this Book, he would confess there is a God.

Though most People would make use of the Former, the Latter of these is the best Expression, the Existence of a GOD being spoken of as a Thing permanent.

Nay, even though the Verb were preceded

by a Verb in the *indicative* Mood, this Way of speaking would still be the best. For Instance, *an Atheist, upon reading this Book, confess there is a God*, is not only a more elegant but a more proper Expression than *an Atheist, upon reading this Book, confess there was a God*; because we are not to suppose that this Man imagined there was a God just at that Time only, but that he looked upon him as a permanent Being existing likewise in future.

For a similar Reason *is* would be a better Word than *was* in the Passages quoted above from *Harris* and *Lord Bolingbroke*.

I will subjoin another Case.

Suppose I meet accidentally in *London* a Man who robbed me lately upon the Road. Which would be the most proper Expression for me to use, *this was the Man* or *this is the Man, that robbed me*? Most People, I imagine, would say *this was the Man*. But *this is the Man* is the properest Expression: For, tho' the Robbery, which is a past Transaction, ought to be mentioned in a past Tense, the Identity of the Man, who still continues the same, is to be spoken of in the present Tense.

LXXXIII. *I Was much delighted with a Person, who hath a great Estate in this Kingdom, upon his Complaints to me how grievously poor England suffers by Importations from Ireland; that we convey our Wool to France, in Spite of all the Harpies at the Custom-House: that Mr Shuttleworth, and others on the Cheshire Coast, are such Fools to sell us their Bark at a good Price, for tanning our own Hides into Leather: with other Enormities of the like Kind.*

SWIFT.

Those among them, who are so unfortunate to have had their Birth and Education in this Country.

In the same Discourse.

To say such Fools to sell us their Bark and so unfortunate to have had their Birth &c. though it is a Way of speaking used by many People, and even by esteemed Writers, is not talking strictly good English. He ought to have said such Fools AS to sell us their Bark—So unfortunate AS to have had their Birth and Education in this Country.

LXXXIV.

LXXXIV. P A I N S.

SOME Writers use a Verb plural with the Substantive *Pains*, where that Substantive is employed figuratively : For Example ; *He took great Pains in that Affair, but his Pains was ill rewarded.*

I think this has no Grace, and that it would be much better to say *His Pains WERE ill rewarded.*

LXXXV. ANGUISHING.

MR Molyneux, in one of his Letters to Mr Locke, has the following Period. *It is an anguishing Thought to me that you should be subject to the common Frailties and Fate of Mankind.*

Anguishing is perhaps a Word of his own Coining : for I don't remember to have seen it in any other Writer. But I think it very expressive, & should be pleased to see it adopted.

LXXXVI.

LXXXVI. D A R E.

NUMBERS of People, though they use the S in the third Person singular of the present Tense of the indicative Mood of other Verbs, omit it in that of the Verb *To dare*, and would say *He dare not do it*, instead of *he dares not*. Many Authors do the same. The Expression is indeed so common that it seems rather too bold to affirm it not to be English. Yet I Confess I see no Grace in it; and the using it appears to *me* to give a Person an Air of Illiterateness.

LXXXVII. **O**UR English Writers very frequently, by the wrong placing a Word, either annihilate Sense, or give a Sense different from what they intend.

The Celtiberi of Spain borrowed that Name from the Celtæ & Iberi, from whom they were jointly descended.

Moyle.

The proper Expression here would have been *from whom jointly they were descended*. This would have signified that the *Celtæ* and the *Iberi*
were

were jointly the Progenitors of the *Celtiber* which is the Author's Meaning; whereas, placing the Word *jointly* as he does, he gives the Reader a confused Idea of a Descent common to the *Celtiberi* and to some other People.

LXXXVIII. OUR'N, TOUR'N, HIS'N,

INfinite Numbers of the low People in the Country (and not a few in *London*,) instead of *his*, *her's*, *our's*, *your's*, *their's*, say *his'n*, *her'n*, *our'n*, *your'n*, *their'n*.

I had not taken Notice of this, but that even Persons of Education are often guilty of the same. I would advise them likewise, in Imitation of many of those low People, to say *Housen*, instead of *Houses*.

LXXXIX. *The Active and the Passive improperly introduced together.*

THE *Effects of it*, says an Author, speaking of Perspective, *are not better explained*

ed by Leonard da Vinci than Plato has done in his Dialogue of the Sophist. This does not make Sense. The Author might have said The Effects of it are not better explained by Leonard da Vinci than Plato has explained them in his Dialogue of the Sophist, or than they are explained by Plato in his Dialogue of the Sophist.

There are perhaps many People, who would feel the Impropriety of his Expression, without immediately perceiving to what it is owing. The Absurdity lies here. *Plato has done* is active. *The Effects of it are not better explained* is passive. When he says *Plato has done*, he means *has explained it*. This *has explained* is active. *The are explained* above is (as I have just now said) passive. Now he uses the two *explaineds* as Words of the same Signification; which, one being passive and the other active, they cannot be. And this it is that makes his Expression Nonfense.

It is a Mortification to me, to have observed that this sort of Barbarism is not unfrequent in even good English Writers, while the very worst of the French are hardly ever guilty of it.

Here follow two Quotations, in each of which
M there

there is a Fault of the same kind with that mentioned above.

Yonder comes the Man we are speaking of, your Friend Theodorus. I should be glad to be introduced to him.—That, said Agoretes, I undertake very frankly to do.

Fordyce's Art of preaching.

All that can now be decently urged is the Reason of the Thing: and this I shall do, more for the Sake of that truly venerable Body than my own.

Dr. Warburton's Preface to Shakespeare.

What is it that *Agoretes* undertakes to do? The Meaning (as we may guess) is that he will introduce the other to *Theodorus*. But it is not properly exprest; the Words *to do*, which are active, referring to the Words *to be introduced*, which are passive. This certainly does not make Sense.

The same Objection lies to the Passage from *Dr. Warburton*.

XC. *The Words BOTH and OR improperly used together.*

THEY are under the same Predicament, says an Author. *They are alike Men both as to Affection or Weakness.*

This does not make Sense. Or would have been proper after the Adverb *either*: but the Adverb *both* required an *and* to follow it. For Instance, *They are alike Men either as to Affection or Weakness.—They are alike Men, both as to Affection and Weakness.*

XCI. **S**WIFT, where he enumerates the Causes of a Country's flourishing, writes in the following Manner.

The first Cause of a Kingdom's thriving is the Fruitfulness of the Soil, &c.—The second is the Industry of the People in working up, &c.—The sixth is by being governed only by Laws made with their own Consent.—The seventh is by Improvement of Land. The Tenth is by disposing of all Offices of Honour, Profit, or Trust, only to the Natives.

One of the Causes is the doing thus, or thus, is

a very proper Expression. But to say *One of the Causes is by doing thus, or thus, or (which is the same Thing) By doing thus, or thus, is one of the Causes*, is talking downright Nonsense.

He ought to have said *The sixth is the being governed only by Laws made with their own Consent. The seventh is the Improvement of Land. The tenth is the disposing of all Offices of Honour, Profit, or Trust, only to the Natives.*

This absurd Mode of Expression is very common with our English Writers. Here follows another Instance of it, that I have just met with.

To this Overture the Count made no other Answer than by a low Bow.

Translation of Keyser's Travels.

This is wrong. The Translator might have said either, *To this Overture the Count made Answer no otherwise than by a low Bow*—or (omitting the Word *by*) *To this Overture the Count made no other Answer than a low Bow.*

He made answer by a low Bow is Sense.—*A low Bow was the Answer he made*, is likewise Sense.

But to say *By a low Bow was the Answer he made*, or *He made no other Answer than by a low Bow*, making thus the Word *by* a Part of the nominative or accusative Case, is talking Nonsense.

Two

XCII. *Two Nominatives with a Verb singular.*

WHEN you are acting towards them in Consequence of what your Justice and Honour requires.

Translation of Cicero's Letters, by Melmoth.

A Verb singular with two nominative Cases singular may perhaps be allowed, where those Nominatives have the same, or very nearly the same Signification : but not else. This is therefore bad English ; and the proper Expression would have been *in Consequence of what your Justice and Honour require.*

The same Translation has the following Period.

'Tis true, into whatever Part of the World he might be cast, he must still retain the same bitter Sensibility of that Ruin, in which both himself and his Country is involved.

There is here no Pretence for the Use of a Verb singular ; and the Translator ought to have written *in which both himself and his Country are involved.*

This Affectation of deviating from the Rules of Grammar merely for the Sake of deviating
from

from them, and where a Freedom of Expression does not require it, is very wrong. Why was Grammar invented, but that, for want of it, Men were unable to convey their Thoughts to each other in a clear and distinct Manner? This was undoubtedly the Reason. And so far are we from being overburdened with Rules of Grammar, that, on the contrary, we are often unintelligible for want of a greater Number of them. If we neglect those we have already, we shall come in Time to understand one another no better than our Ancestors did before the Language was brought into any Form.

XCIII. ANTECEDENT.

WE have several Writers, who employ this Word ungrammatically.

This is evident from a Letter to Atticus, written about four Years antecedent to the Fact, of which I am speaking.

Notes on Cicero's Letters.

Though these four Years were antecedent to the Fact, the Expression of *written about four Years*

Years antecedent to the Fact is not proper: for *antecedent*, when thus joined with *written*, is used adverbially. But *antecedent* is not an Adverb.

Written antecedently to the Fact by about four Years would have been good English. And, if the Translator had disliked the Adverb, another Turn might have been given to the Period, and the Word *written* might either have been placed immediately after *Letter*, or have been omitted. For Example, *This is evident from a Letter written to Atticus, about four Years antecedent to the Fact, of which I am speaking.*—*This is evident from a Letter to Atticus, about four Years antecedent to the Fact, of which I am speaking.*

Here *antecedent* agrees with the Substantive *Letter*, which it can't do, when joined, as above, with the Word *written*. And if you suppose it to agree with *Years*, you make Nonsense.

XCIV. *YOU* and *THOU* employed together.

SHOULD Fortune continue to persecute me, will you, thou dear, unhappy Woman, will you fondly throw away, in gaining Friends to a desperate Cause, the last scanty Remains of your desperate Fortunes?

Cicero's Letters.

The using *you* and *thou* in the same Period (and more especially so very near together) is an unnatural Way of writing. And yet we have many Authors guilty of it. Pope is not a little faulty in this Particular.

XCV. *Every one* made Plural,

I Shall very zealously persevere in my Applications not only to Cæsar, but to all those who are most in his Favour, every one of whom I have experienced to be much my Friends.

Ibid.

Though *Every one* be a Noun of Number, it has no Grace used as a Plural; and the Translator ought to have said *Every one of whom I have experienced to be much my Friend*.

The Translator says in another Part of the
same

same Letter. *They are every one of them my Friends.* Here the Substantive is rightly put in the plural Number, and it would have been improper to say *they are every one of them my Friend.* But it is to be considered that in this Place the Words *my Friends* belong to the Words *they are*; which makes the Expression of *They are my Friends.* As to the Words *every one of them*, they stand by themselves, and ought to be included between two Commas. They are brought in (as one may say) by Way of Explanation. When therefore a Man says *They are, every one of them, my Friends*, it is as though he said *They are my Friends. I speak not of some of them only, but of all.*

XCVI. *E*Xcepting Orpheus, there is none of them, that have any great Claim to this Favour. Ibid.

The Verb singular *is* and the Verb plural *have*, introduced thus together, make a Confusion. The Translator ought to have said either *there are none of them that have any great Claim*, or *there is no one of them that has any great Claim.*

XCVII. *MUCH LESS.*

THIS Expression is often used where it is not proper.

Tell me whether I can with a good Grace ask him to allow me even the least Time for the Payment of this Money; much less above a Year.

Ibid.

Much less above a Year does not here make Sense. *More especially above a Year* would have been the proper Expression.

Had the Writer put a full Stop at the Word *Money*, and ceased there to propose a Question, and had afterwards spoken positively, *much less* might have been used. For Example, *Tell me whether I can with a good Grace ask him to allow me even the least Time for the Payment of this Money. Much less can I ask of him above a Year.*

The Reader will observe that here is no Note of Interrogation at *Year*; and that the Words are therefore an Affirmation, and not a Question,

XCVIII. **H**E acquitted himself so much to my Satisfaction that I had Reason to think

think I received, instead of bestowed, a Favour, when I nominated him to that Employment,

Ibid.

The Translator, I conceive, wrote *bestowed*, as judging that the Word ought to be in the same Mood and Tense with *received*, to which it stands in Opposition. But I believe every discerning Person, who takes the least Time to consider, will find that this Word cannot properly be made use of with *instead*, and that *instead of bestow'd*, hardly makes Sense.

With *instead*, *bestowing* is the proper Word. On the other Hand, if we say *bestowed*, the Word ought to be accompanied by the Adverb *not*. As, for Example,

He acquitted himself so much to my Satisfaction that I had Reason to think I received, instead of bestowing a Favour, when I nominated him to that Employment.——He acquitted himself so much to my Satisfaction that I had Reason to think I received, and not that I bestowed, a Favour, when I nominated him to that Employment.

This Mistake of the Translator reminds me of a certain Impropriety very common among us both in speaking and writing. Many People
(I be-

I believe, indeed, the greatest Part) would express themselves in this Manner,—*He has not work'd this Afternoon. He has done nothing but play'd.*

This is wrong. The proper Expression is *He has done nothing but play.* This Word *Play* is here in the infinitive Mood; and it is as though we said *To play is the only Thing that he has done*, which makes Sense; whereas *Play'd is the only Thing that he has done*, is Nonsense.

An infinitive Mood may supply the Place of a Noun Substantive: but a Verb in another Mood cannot.

XCIX. DIFFERENT THAN.

I Found your Affairs had been managed in a different Manner than what I had advised.

Ibid.

A different Manner than is not English. We say *different to* and *different from*; to the last of which Expressions I have in another Place given the Preference, as seeming to make the best Sense,

Omission

C. Omission of a Preposition:

HIS Compliance can by no Means be considered in the favourable Light which he here represents it.

Ibid.

This is a very bad, though a very common Way of writing. The Translator ought to have repeated the Preposition *in*, (for the Imagination of the Reader can't supply it without Pain) and to have said, *His Compliance can by no Means be considered in the favourable Light, in which he here represents it.*

CI. *I Never expect to reap any Advantage from my Labours of this kind.*

Ibid.

Cicero speaking here of what he at the Time of his writing supposed would be the Consequence of those Labours, the proper Expression would have been *I don't expect ever to reap any Advantage from my Labours of this Kind, or I have no Expectation of ever reaping any Advantage from my Labours of this Kind.*

'There is a Difference between the never expecting

pecting to receive and the not expecting ever to receive.

If I say *I often do that Man Kindnesses, but I never expect him to make any Return*, the Meaning is that I, at the Time of my doing those Kindnesses, have no Expectation that the Man will, at any future Time, make a Return.

But, if I say *I often do that Man Kindnesses, but I don't expect him ever to make a Return*, the Meaning may be that I, at the Time of my speaking, have no Expectation that the Man will ever make a Return.

CII. *I Wonder that such a valiant Hero as you should trifle away your Time in making War upon Women.*

Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope.

This is wrongly expressed. It is the Substantive *Hero*, not the Substantive *You*, which ought to determine the Person of the Pronoun, that serves as an adjective to *Time*. The Writer should therefore have said, *I wonder that such a valiant Hero as you should trifle away his Time in making War upon Women.*

CIII. HE

CIII. *HE is the Author of two Works of a very different Character.*

This, which I thnk I took from the Biographical Dictionary, would be a proper Expressi-
on, had the Writer been just mentioning some
other Work, and had these two Works now
spoken of, been of the same Character with one
another, because *two Works of a different Cha-
racter* would then signify *two Works of a Cha-
racter different from the Character of the Work
already mentioned.*

But this is not the Case. He has not been
speaking of any other Work : and his Mean-
ing is that these two are very different from
each other. He ought therefore either to have
said *of very different Characters*, which would
have expressed his Meaning, or to have used
the singular Number without the *a*, and have
said *of very different Character*, which would
have had the same Signification. Of these two
Expressions the last is the most elegant.

I well know that the Expression *a different*
(or *a very different*) is often employed in the
Manner which I here condemn ; and I am not
sure that any even of our best Writers take
Care

Care to avoid it. But, whatever Authority it may plead, it is not a clear Expression, and therefore I can never think it right.

CIV. **W**E have a certain strange Barbarism in our Tongue, which in all Probability will never be banished.

The *s* with an Apostrophe which occurs so frequently at the End of Substantives, is a Contraction of *his*. Instead of saying *The House of that Man, the Horse of that Man, &c.* we say *that Man's House, that Man's Horse*; which Expressions are Contractions of *That Man his House, that Man his Horse*.

One would imagine then that, in speaking of what belongs to a Woman, we should use the Word *her*; and, in speaking of what belongs to several Persons, the Word *their*. And yet the *s*, the Contraction of *his*, is used even in these Cases; and, instead of *That Woman her Estate, those Men their Properties*, we say *That Woman's Estate, those Men's Properties*: which are Contractions of *That Woman his Estate, Those Men his Properties*. This is certainly (as I have said) a strange Barbarism.

It

It is necessary to observe that to mark the Elision after a Plural Number, where for the avoiding the disagreeable Repetition of the Sound of the Letter *s*, not the *hi* only, but the whole Word *his*, is cut off, the Apostrophe ought to be put not between the two last Letters of this plural Number, but at the End of it.

For Instance, *The English Kings' Palaces*; which signifies *The Palaces of the English Kings*. Here the Apostrophe is put where the whole Word *his* is omitted; for the Expression at full length would be *The English Kings his Palaces*.

This is what few People observe. Ninety-nine in a Hundred would write *The English King's Palaces*. But this Expression would not give their Meaning: for *The English King's Palaces* does not signify *the Palaces of the English Kings*: it signify *the Palaces of the English King*.

This Observation has nothing to do with Plurals that don't end with the Letter *s*, as *Men*, *Women*, &c.

CV. **T**HE seeming Importance given to every Part of Female Dress, each of which is committed to the Care and Protection of a different Sylph.

O

Sylph, with all the Solemnity, &c.

Ibid.

The Word *each* does not make Sense where it refers only to one Noun Substantive singular. Now it refers here only to *every Part*; and *every Part* is singular.

Neither can I think *different* a proper Word in this Place; and that for the same Reason which I have given in the last Observation but one. If I say *a different Sylph*, when no other *Sylph* either is or has been mentioned, I cannot see that the Word *different* has any Meaning.

A Word implying *separate, distinct, particular*, would have been more proper; and the Author might have written in the following Manner,—*The seeming Importance given to all the Parts of Female Dress, each of which is committed to the Care and Protection of a separate (or of a particular) Sylph, with all the Solemnity, &c.*

The Word *separate*, which may here appear a little stiff, would no longer appear so, if it once began to be used in the Places where I have said I think the Word *different* improper. And I should imagine the Sense of it must be owned to be just.

THE

CVI. **T**HE Wounds inflicted are suitable to the Nature of each different Instrument said to inflict them.

Ibid.

The Words *each* and *different*, just now disapproved of, as being severally improperly employed, are here brought in together in such a Manner, as makes something of a Confusion of Sense. Either of them might have been introduced singly : but *different* must have been made a Plural, and *each* must have referred to *Wounds*, and not have been made an Adjective to *Instrument* : as for Instance, *The Wounds inflicted are suitable to the Nature of the different Instruments said to inflict them.*—*The Wounds inflicted are suitable, each to the Nature of the particular Instrument said to inflict it.*

It is to me unaccountable that Writers should make this Word *each* of the plural Number, where it refers to single Objects. One would imagine that even the smallest Degree of Understanding should inform them it is singular. In making it plural, they make it synonymous either with *both*, or with the plural of *all* : whereas it signifies *every one, singly considered.*

Each of these Experiments, says a Book that lies before me, have something peculiar to them.

Thirteen of these unfortunate Rivals, says the Translator of Cicero's Letters, entered the List; and each of them in their Turn paid the Forfeiture of their Lives.

These Writers ought to have said, Each of these Experiments has something peculiar to it.—Thirteen of these unfortunate Rivals entered the List; and each of them in his Turn paid the Forfeiture of his Life.

CVII. *It is equally the same.*

THIS Expression, so frequently in the Mouths of the lower sort of People, who mean by it *It is the same*, or *it is all one*, would not be worth mentioning, if it did not sometimes escape their Betters.

As it is used, it is Nonsense; for the Word *equally* ought to refer to something, whereas, as these People use it, it is made to refer to Nothing.

THE

CVIII. **T**HE Word *both*, of the improper Use of which I have already spoken, is frequently brought in with *equal* or *equally* in an absurd Manner. For Instance, *Those two Men are both equal in Capacity.*—*Those two Men are both equally ambitious*

A and B are equal in Capacity is Sense. This means that they are equal to each other.

A and B are both equal in Capacity to C is likewise Sense. It signifies that A is equal to C, and that B is likewise equal to C in Capacity.

But, if I say simply that A and B are both equal in Capacity, I talk Nonsense: for these Words signify only that A is equal in Capacity, and that B is likewise equal in Capacity, without implying to whom, So that the Word *equal* has nothing to which it refers,

We have Numbers of Authors (and some of them very good ones) who don't attend to this

CIX. **I**T is generally allowed that the Author of the Discourse of Free-thinking, and of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion was one and the same,

Preface to the Divine Legation.

I think this is ill expressed. When the Writer says *The Author of the Discourse of Free-thinking and of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, the very Words seem to suppose these two Works to be produced by one Man. And what Wonder is it that this one Man should be one and the same?

The Word *Author* ought to have been repeated, and the Verb should have been in the plural Number. For Instance, *It is generally allowed that the Author of the Discourse of Free-thinking and the Author of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion were one and the same.*

Faults of this Sort are very common in our English Writers.

CX. **N**Otwithstanding (as has been already observed) there is not a more common Fault in speaking, the using the Verb *to lay* instead of *to lie*, while we scarcely ever hear the Word *lie* where *lay* would be proper; there are some few Writers, who are guilty of saying *have lain* which is a Preterperfect of *to lie*) where they

they ought to say *have laid*, a Preterperfect of *to lay*.

Among others, *Bluet* has this Expression in his very sensible (though little known) Answer to *Mandeville's Fable of the Bees*.—*The Restraints*, says he, *that Education, Custom and Decency have lain them under*, &c.—and, in another Place, *after they have lain aside all Pretences to it*. This is not good English. He ought to have used the Word *laid*, and not *lain*; for *lain* is the Participle of *lie*. We dont say *to lie People under Restraints*, or *to lie aside Pretences*, but, *to lay People under Restraints*, and *to lay aside Pretences*.

CXI. EN PASSANT.

INSTEAD of *en passant*, my Lord Shaftesbury makes use of the English Words, *in passing*. Herein I think he is right. The Expression of *in passing*, or *in passing along*, is perfectly intelligible. and very easy. We have therefore no Need of the French Words.

It would indeed be well if foreign Word^s could be intirely banished: The Use of them
has

has something in it unnatural, and gives the Language, into which they are dragg'd, an Air of Poverty. Where we want a Word in our own Tongue to express any particular Idea, we ought either to take a foreign Word, and give it an English Form and an English Pronunciation, (as we have already done in many Instances) or to invent a Word ourselves.

CXII. **T**HE Adverbs *neither* and *nor* are not to be used with the Adverb *not* and the Pronoun Adjective *no*.

I have received no Letter, neither from him, nor from his Brother.—I have not heard any News neither of him, nor of his Brother,

This is wrong. The proper Way of speaking is, *I have received no Letter, either from him, or from his Brother.—I have not heard any News, either of him, or of his Brother.*

This is, as I have said, the correct Way of speaking. But we ought not to resolve never to deviate from it. In very animated Speeches, where a Man were delivering himself with Vehemence and Heat, *neither* and *nor*, as having
a more

a more forcible Sound than *either* and *or*, might perhaps be used not with an ill Grace.

CXIII. O N. O F.

THE latter of these Words is frequently used where I should imagine the former to be preferable. *On a sudden*, and *to send on an Errand*, appear to me much better than *of a sudden*, and *to send of an Errand*.

I should likewise think *It happened on such a Day* much more proper than *It happened of such a Day*.

We common say *To fall foul of* (and not *to fall foul on*) a Person. Yet we have some few Writers, who say *to fall foul on*: and it seems to make better Sense than *To fall foul of*. It were therefore to be wished it were brought into Use.

In speaking above of the Word *Demeanour*, I have said *If the lower People were to get hold of it*. Yet I think *to get hold on* and *to lay hold on* are better Expressions (tho' less common) than *to get hold of* and *to lay hold of*.

CXIV. *HIS* Health beginning to decline, says the new Biographical Dictionary, *he was no longer able to go through Business with that Vigour and Zeal as he wished.*

That Vigour and Zeal as he wished is not English: for *as* is not to be used in this Manner with the Pronoun *that*. It may be used with *such*, or with *so much*, or *so great*.

For instance, *He was no longer able to go through Business with such Vigour and Zeal as he wished.—with so much Vigour and Zeal as he wished.—with so great a Vigour and Zeal as he wished.*

The Vigour and Zeal as he wished would likewise be bad English.

CXV. *THE* same Performance, speaking of one *Konig*, says *He was extremely deaf some Years before he died.*

If he became deaf several Years before he died, and his Deafness continued during those several Years, (as seems to have been the Case) it would have been better to say *He was deaf for some Years before he died.* The Word *for* would have

have made it clear that his Deafness continued ; whereas we may say that a Man was deaf some Years before he died, if he became so several Years before his Death, and, after some Time, recovered his Hearing.

These seeming Minuties are by no Means to be despised, since they contribute to the Intelligibleness of Language.

CXVI. S O R T S.

THIS Plural is often improperly used, not only in common Discourse, but by many of our Writers, instead of the Singular, *Sort*.

If I see a large Number of Swords packed up for Exportation, it would be wrong in me to say *There will be a considerable Profit upon these Swords ; for these Sorts of Goods sell well where they are going* : for though these Swords are so many different Objects, they make but one sort of Goods. I ought therefore to say *this Sort of Goods sells*, and not *these Sorts of Goods sell*.

CXVII. **W**E have Instances in our Tongue of Verbs in the third Person without a Nominative Case.

Though he commends her upon the Whole, he censures her so far as regards her Conduct in that particular Affair.

This is certainly good English, notwithstanding the Word *regards* have no Nominative.

But these Verbs without a Nominative ought (as I apprehend) to be always in the singular Number.

The Preface, says the Monthly Reviewer, contains some general Observations on Military Matters, so far as concern a Militia.

I can't allow this to be English. He certainly ought to have said *so far as concerns a Militia*: for neither the plural Substantive *Observations*, nor the plural Substantive *Matters* has any thing to do in determining the Number of this Verb.

CXVIII. **T**HERE are numberless Instances even in Writers not despicable in point of Sense, of the gross Violation
of

of Grammar of joining Participles with Verbs by the Copulative *and*. For Example. *He began now to live in a different Manner; the Estate, that was fallen to him, setting him at his Ease and made him very happy.*

Here the Word *and* joins the Participle *setting* and the Verb *made*.

CXIX. *IN* him, says some Author, *were happily blended true Dignity with softness of Manners.*

This Way of speaking, where a Noun singular is made a Nominative to a Verb plural, when such Noun is followed by one or more Nouns preceded by the Preposition *with*, is very common both in English and in French; and it must be owned that in many Places it appears easy and natural. But in many others there is an Uncouthness in it, the Violation of Grammar being too palpable; and it requires some Delicacy of Ear to judge where it is allowable and where not. In the Instance here brought I think it somewhat offensive; and I would rather have said *In him was happily blended*

ed true Dignity with softness of Manners, or In him true Dignity was happily blended with softness of Manners, or In him were happily blended true Dignity and softness of Manners.

CXX. *THEY* are so far from promoting real Trade, that the Support of themselves and Families are a dead Weight on its Profits.
Monthly Reviewer.

I have already spoken of employing a Verb plural with a nominative Case singular, on account of the intervening of a genitive Case plural between the two Words, and have condemned the Practice, it giving the Sentence a very unnatural Sound. These Writers are here guilty of it in saying *the Support are a dead Weight*.

But there is another Fault in these Lines.—*Of themselves and Families*, for *of themselves and their Families*, is very bad Expression, though very common. It is mere Shopkeepers Cant. (*Harris and Son, Clarke and Son, Brown and Son*) and will always sound contemptible in the Ears of Persons of any Taste.

SCARCELY

CXXI. S C A R C E L Y.

*I*S there a Man scarcely to be found of a Temper so truly mortified as to acquiesce in the lowest and shortest Necessaries of Life? Harris.

This is a French Expression, but not an English one, though used by many of our Writers. At least, it is not an English Expression in the Sense, which it is here intended to convey. In another Sense it is properly used in English.

The Author, as the Tenor of his Discourse shews, is of Opinion that a Man so thoroughly mortified, can scarcely be found. But, whatever a Frenchman might do, an Englishman would not use such an Interrogatory to express this Opinion. He would say either *Is it easy to find?* or *is it not very difficult?* or *is it not almost impossible to find such a Man?* These are, I say, the Interrogatories an Englishman would use to signify that he supposes such a Man can hardly be found.

On the other Hand, if he were of a contrary Opinion, and thought it not a very difficult Matter to find such a Man, he would upon
hearing

hearing another talk of the great Difficulty of it, naturally say, *is there then scarcely to be found a Man so mortified?* which would imply that for his Part he did not think it so very difficult to find one.

I have said that the Author's Expression is *French* in the Sense in which he intends it, but not English.

A Frenchman (for Instance) would say *Peut on a peine trouver un tel homme?* (literally, *can one scarcely (or hardly) find such a Man?* to signify that he really believed it almost impossible to find such a Man. But, if he meant to signify that he should not have thought it so very difficult, he would say *Ne peut on donc qu'à peine trouver un tel homme?* literally, *Can't one then otherwise than hardly find such a Man?* And it is perhaps from an intended Imitation of the French that Mr Harris and some other Writers employ the Word *scarcely* in an Interrogatory in such a Manner as *with us* gives a Sense contrary to what they purpose should be conveyed.

CXXII. **T**HE Divine Legation, explaining a Passage in *Virgil*, says, *But an old Poem under the Name of Orpheus, intituled A Descent into Hell, had it been now existing, would perhaps have shewn us that no more was meant than Orpheus's Initiation.*

Had such a Thing been THEN existing, it would have had such an Effect, is a proper Way of speaking.—Had it been NOW existing, it would have had such an Effect, though many People would express themselves in this Manner, is hardly Sense.

I think the Author should have written as follows—*But an old Poem under the Name of Orpheus, intituled A Descent into Hell, were it now existing, would perhaps shew us that no more is meant than Orpheus's Initiation.*

CXXIII. **H**AVING quoted the following Period in Remark 39, *If you were here, you would find three or four in the Parlour after Dinner, whom you would say pass-ed their Afternoons as jocundly as any People you have this good While met with, I have condemned only the Word whom. But there is another Word which is wrong. Mr. Locke ought to have written who you would say pass their Afternoons, &c. not passed.*

Q

For

For the Reason of this, see Remark 82.

CXXIV. O N E.

WOULD a reasonable Person believe it possible for Writers to make this Word plural, where it means (as it almost always does) an Individual? and yet we sometimes find it made so.

Not one in an hundred, says a Book called Advice from a Bishop to a Clergyman, either read or speak in publick with any Propriety.

I am afraid the good Bishop himself never spoke with much Propriety in Regard to his Choice of Words. What could induce him to say *read and speak*, and not *reads and speaks*? Could he suppose that the Word *Hundred* was to determine the Person of the Verbs?

This is a Fault not unlike that which I have taken Notice of in Remark LXX.

There are indeed Places where the Word *one* ought to be made plural. If I say *Courtiers and Anti-courtiers are pretty much alike. The One*

One have no more the Interest of the Nation at Heart than the others : This is a proper Way of speaking, and it would be wrong to say *has the Interest*, because *the one* here refers to a Substantive (or to Substantives) plural.

CXXV. ONE OF THEIR &c.

LET us suppose three Houses to belong in common to three Men, each Man having a Share in each House. If one of these Houses happen to fall, the Expression of *one of their Houses is fallen*, or *one of those Men's Houses is fallen* would, without Doubt, be very proper.

But I believe ninety-nine Persons in a Hundred would make use of the same Expression where it would not be proper ; or, at least, where it would not be the best Way of speaking.

We will suppose a Man to be the sole Proprietor of one House. If this House should fall, there are few People but what, seeing this Man in Company with other Men, and mentioning the Accident, would (as I have hinted above) use the same Expression, and say *one of their Houses is fallen*, or *one of those Men's Houses is fallen*.

But this (as I said just now) would not be the best Way of speaking. It would be much better to say *the House of one of those Men is fallen*, or *the House of one of them is fallen*: for these Words, conveying but one Idea, could not be mis-understood; whereas *one of those Men's Houses is fallen* might be understood to signify that those Men had some Houses in common, and that one of those Houses was fallen down.

CXXVI. *Only. Not only. Neither. Either.*

THERE are innumerable Instances of the wrong placing these Words.

Only, by not being in its proper Place, gives a Sense not intended. *Not only, Neither* and *Either*, by being out of their Places, make Nonfense.

Theism, says my Lord Shaftesbury, *can only be opposed to Polytheism or Atheism*.

He ought to have said *Theism can be opposed only to Polytheism or Atheism*: For his Meaning is that Polytheism & Atheism are the only Things to which Theism can be opposed. But his Words don't imply this: for *Theism can only be opposed to Polytheism or Atheism* signifies that Theism is not capable of any Thing, except of being opposed to Polytheism or Atheism; which is a quite different

different Sense. Besides, it makes a false Assertion: for, though it may be true that Polytheism and Atheism are the only Species of Belief to which Theism can stand in Opposition, yet there are many other Things of which Theism is capable. It is capable of influencing a Man's Conduct. It is capable of gaining him the good Will of another in the same, or of exciting the Aversion of those in a different Way of thinking. In short, there is no saying of how many Things it is capable.

He was not only an Eye-witness of those Affairs, but had a great Share in them.

Biographical Dictionary.

He was neither learned in the Languages, nor Philosophy. Ibid.

The proper Way of speaking is *He not only was an Eye-witness of those Affairs, but had a great share in them.* The *not only* ought to precede the *was*, not to follow it.—*He was learned neither in the Languages nor in Philosophy. Learned* ought to precede *neither*.

When we say, *He was not only an Eye-witness of those Affairs, but had a great Share in them*, the Sense of the Word *was*, by this Word's being put before the *not only*, is brought forward to the *but had a great share in them*. It is therefore the same as if we said *He was not only an Eye-*

Eye-witness of those Affairs, but also he was had a great share in them; which is Nonsense.

So likewise in the other Sentence, *He was neither learned in the Languages, nor Philosophy*, by putting *neither* before *learned*, the Word *Philosophy*, which ought to be opposed only to *the Languages*, becomes opposed to *learned in the Languages*; whereby we say *He neither was learned in the Languages nor was he Philosophy*; which also is Nonsense.

I own it astonishes me that our Writers should go on from Age to Age expressing themselves in this slovenly Manner, when there is not one Instance in ten of the Fault's being committed, where it would not have been easy to avoid it. Sometimes indeed there is no avoiding the Impropriety without a Stiffness or Heaviness of Expression. In either of these Cases it is to be suffered.

Wherein not only their Wants were to be satisfied, but all their Appetites and Passions to be gratified.

Lord Bolingbroke.

Here the *not only* is rightly placed. But the same Writer in the following Sentence has placed it wrong. *They speak not only of the Law, but refer to many of the Facts related in the Pentateuch.* By putting *speak* before *not only*, he has brought forward the Sense of this Word,

Speak, to the latter Part of the Sentence, and made Nonsense, for it is as though he said *They speak not only of the Law. They likewise speak refer to many of the Facts related in the Pentateuch.*

If a Man says *I speak not only of him, but of all his Companions*, here the Word *speak* is rightly placed before the *not only*, because the *all his Companions* stands opposed to the *him*; for which Reason the Sense of the Word, *speak*, ought to be brought forward to the latter Part of the Sentence, the Meaning of the Speaker being this, *I speak not of him only. I likewise speak of all his Companions.*

CXXVII. **O**NE of the greatest Barbarisms in the English Tongue, and which it amazes me that scarcely any Author avoids, is the using the preterperfect Tense of the Infinitive Mood where we ought to use the present or future.

I was going to have writ him a Letter.—I intended to have writ to him.—Can there be greater Nonsense than this? Is it not plain we ought to say I was going to write him a Letter.—I intended to write to him? When

When we talk of going to *have done* a Thing, or of intending to *have done* it, we speak of the Thing's being done, as prior to the setting about it or intending it.

We have indeed one Verb, which claims an indulgence in this Particular, and which it is necessary to follow with the preterperfect Tense of the infinitive Mood, where it would be proper to follow other Verbs with the present or future.

This is the Verb *ought*, which is irregular and never varies in its Termination. If it were a regular Verb, it's Preterimperfect and Preterperfect would be *oughted*: and in that Case, if I intended to tell a Man that it was his Duty upon some past Occasion to act otherwise than he did, the proper Expression would be *You oughted to act so and so*, and not *You oughted to HAVE ACTED so and so*: for this last Expression would contain the same Absurdity as those which I have condemned above. Indeed the Absurdity is contained in the Expression we *do* use, viz: *You ought to have done it*. But there is no avoiding it, as this Verb does not change it's Termination: for when we speak in the present Tense, we say *You ought to DO so and so*; and our using the same Expression in a past Tense would cause a Confusion.

F I N I S.



TO THE KING.

S I R,

♦♦♦♦♦ OUR MAJESTY having
 ♦♦♦ ♦♦ lately been pester'd with certain
 ♦♦ Y ♦♦ Petitions, of which it is hard to
 ♦♦ ♦♦♦ say whether they shew most of
 ♦♦♦♦♦ Stupidity or of Insolence in the Pe-
 tioners, & being perhaps doom'd
 to be pester'd with several more, I take the Op-
 portunity of mixing with the Crowd, to make
 your Majesty a Proposal or two, to which, I
 imagine, your giving a favourable Ear would
 be for the Benefit of Society.

My first Proposal is that your Majesty would
 at some leisure Hour take it into Consideration
 whether it might not be proper to establish in
London an Academy of the Nature of that of
 the *Belles Lettres* at *Paris*, and of several in *Italy*.
 This seems to be a Thing extremely wanted a-
 mong us. Our Language, as has been often
 observed, is manly and expressive: but our
 A Writers

Writers abound with Incorrectnesses and Barbarisms: for which such a Establishment might in a great Measure be a Cure.

I shall take the Liberty of mentioning some Part of the Plan, on which I have been thinking such an Academy might not improperly be formed; not as presuming to offer in any wise a Plan to be followed; but as being conscious that the Schemes of Persons of inferior Abilities contain now and then a Hint that is approved of by better Heads.

In my Reveries then on the Subject, I have thought that this Academy might be composed of fifty Persons. In that of *Paris* there are but forty; which Number may be sufficient where the Members are all Inhabitants of the Place, as I take it they are there. But it might not be an ill Compliment (nor perhaps more than Good-manners would require) to admit some Gentlemen from our Universities; eight for Instance from *Oxford* and six from *Cambridge*. The Reason of my pitching upon a smaller Number from *Cambridge* than from *Oxford*, is not my supposing the Gentlemen of that University to have less Merit than those of this, but the University's being considerably smaller. Of these fourteen Members, four from *Oxford* and three from *Cambridge* should be Heads of Houses (for it would be hard if four out of five-and-twenty and three out of seventeen, who are all appointed such for their supposed Learning and Parts, should not be worthy of being admitted into this Academy

Academy) and the whole eight from *Oxford* and six from *Cambridge* should be chosen by the Gentlemen of their respective Universities (residing there) from Doctors down to Masters of Arts. Upon the Death of any one, another should be chosen in the same Manner. The thirty-six supposed to reside in *London* should be first nominated by the Sovereign; after which, the Members themselves, upon any Death, should fill up the Vacancy, as is practised at *Paris*. I mean that these thirty-six alone should fill it up: for, as they would have no Vote in chusing Members from the Universities, it would not be reasonable for these to interfere in chusing Members resident in *London*.

The second Thing I take the Liberty of proposing to your Majesty, is to consider whether there might not be found out a much more expeditious Method of teaching Languages than any hitherto practised, and at the same Time much less unpleasant to the Learner. I make not the least Doubt there might. The universal Method of teaching, or *pretending* to teach, Latin and Greek is, in particular, so very absurd that I can never think of it without Astonishment.

The Generality of Boys, who pass five, six, or seven Years at School, are so very imperfect even in the *Latin* Tongue (not to speak of the *Greek*) at their coming away, that they might almost as well be entirely ignorant of it. When they are grown up, they know still less of it than at

their leaving the School, because not understanding it well enough, when they come away, to comprehend a Latin Author with Ease, so as to read him with any sort of Pleasure, they entirely neglect the Language from that Time, and consequently forget some Part even of the little they once knew. Some few indeed, who are fond of Books, and have a good deal of Leisure, pursue the Study of it after leaving the School, and come to understand it well. But the Number of these is very small.

Now the Reason of their learning so little at School is that, properly speaking, they are not taught, but are left, in a Manner, to find out every Thing themselves. The Grammar, with which they begin, consists of dry Rules, which young Boys don't well understand even when they have learnt them by Heart: for, in short, these Rules are delivered in a concise and obscure Way, not well adapted to the Capacity of Children: and yet a considerable Time is commonly spent in thus learning them by Heart.— This is called a *Foundation*.

After this, a Dictionary and one of the easiest Latin Authors are put into their Hands. By the Help of this Dictionary and of the confused Knowledge they have of the Rules they have gone through, they are to render this Author into English; and a few Lines are given for every Lesson: in which Lesson, after hammering their Brains about it for an Hour or two, even your bright Boys are commonly very imperfect;
and

and, as to to your dull ones, they have little or no Conception of the Meaning of the Writer.

When they have gone through a Part of this Book, a more difficult one is given them, with which they make almost as dreadful Work as with the first: for, though by this Time they know a very small Matter more of the Language than they did, yet the superior Difficulty of the Stile is perhaps equal, or nearly equal, to that additional Knowledge.

In this Manner they pass from one Author to a more difficult one, for five, six, seven Years, or more, till they have gone through the most difficult ones of all: and then, truly, they are supposed to be Latin Scholars. And yet their Knowledge of the Language, after all this Time painfully spent, is superficial and confused. I speak of Boys in general: for some few come to understand well not only Latin, but even Greek, before they leave the School.

Now I make no doubt that the Cause I have assigned, is the real Cause of their making so very little Progress, viz. the small Assistance they receive from the Master, and the being left, as it were, to find out every Thing themselves.

The Method, in which French is taught, is far from being so absurd as that of teaching Latin and Greek: for Dialogues are put into the Scholars' Hands, where they have the French on one Side, and the English on the other; which is very right. But then these Dialogues consist almost entirely of common Phrases relating to
the

the most familiar Objects, and take in but a small Part of the Language. A Man may be Master of all the Dialogues that are to be met with in French Grammars, and yet not be able to understand well even an easy French Author. And, though the Master may now and then read other Books with his Scholar, and explain every Thing as he goes along, these Lessons are so short and so seldom repeated that they are of little Use. Accordingly, we see that not one in five of those, who learn French of a Master, attains more than a very trifling Knowledge of the Language. Bring a Boy, that has been taught French at one of our great Boarding-Schools, into a Company of French People, and he will be as much *in a Maze*, to use an Expression of *Congreve's*, as a Dog in a Dancing-School. He will not comprehend a twentieth Part of the Conversation. Nay, he will comprehend but little of it, even supposing him to know what Words are uttered. But this he will be almost entirely ignorant of: for, from the rapid Manner in which these People pronounce, a Manner so very different from what his Master used while he was teaching him, he will not perhaps be able to catch one Word in three or four.

Now, if the Account, that I have given, be a just one, (and that it is so I am persuaded Nobody will deny, that is not very ignorant of the Matter, or very disingenuous) is it not greatly to be lamented that so many of the Years of Youth should be spent to so little Purpose?

Were

Were these Years (it is true) passed in a Manner pleasant to themselves, while they make so trifling an improvement, it would be something, and their loss of Time in Regard to the future Part of their Life would be the less to be regretted. But this is not the Case. These Years are spent not only unprofitably, but unhappily. We may talk what we will, when we are grown up, of the enviable Condition of young Boys and Girls, and wish to be as free from Anxiety as *they* are. We forget, for the most Part, what we formerly endured, and recollect Nothing but the pleasant Circumstances of the Time that is past. All Stages of Life have their Pains and their Conveniencies: and, if Children are free from the Cares that corrode the Hearts of the Adult, they have Pains of their own, that bring their Condition to a Level with that of their Elders. The Dread of Apparitions, Subjection to their Parents and Instructors, and the Difficulty they find in apprehending what they are appointed to learn, are a large Drawback from the Happiness that we commonly allow them.

If then a Method could be found of teaching Languages (the learning of which is so perplexing to Youth) that should be far more expeditious and effective, and at the same Time far less unpleasant, than the Methods hitherto in Use, ought it not to be universally adopted, as not only lessening the Pain endured in the early Part of Life, but likewise increasing the Pleasure of the subsequent Parts? For a thorough or
a com-

a competent Knowledge of those Languages must certainly be more useful and afford more Pleasure than a superficial and confused one.

Now whether the following Plan, which was lately formed for teaching the French Tongue, is not a rational one, and whether the Latin and Greek, and all other Languages ought not to be taught in much the same Way, is submitted to all Persons of Understanding, who will endeavour to divest themselves of Prejudice for old Customs.

The Plan is this. To establish a School in a large Room, capable of holding a great Number of People; such, for Instance, as an Auction-Room. As many Scholars may be admitted as the Room will conveniently allow. They are to have three (or perhaps four) Lessons every Week. Each Lesson is to hold two Hours and a Half. The first Quarter of an Hour is to be for the Instruction of Beginners, and is to be employed in telling them the French for such and such Words. The English Word is to be delivered first: then the French Word of the same Signification: and as soon as it is pronounced, it is to be spelt to them. If it be a Substantive, they are to be told whether it is masculine or feminine. If an Adjective, they are to be told both the masculine Gender and the feminine; and both the Genders are to be spelt to them.

After this, some entertaining and instructive Author is to be read for two Hours. A Sentence

tence is to be first read in English by an Englishman. Then the same Sentence in French by a Frenchman.

The last Quarter of an Hour is to be employed in delivering Rules, and informing the Scholars of such Peculiarities in the French Tongue as it may be supposed many Persons even tolerably versed therein may yet be ignorant of.

The Authors that are read are to be (as has been said above) instructive or amusing, and are to consist chiefly of History; moral Discourses that are at the same Time ingenious and easy, such as *Addison's* serious *Spectators*; humorous ones, such as his *Spectators* upon low trivial Subjects; natural History, such as *Nature Displayed*; and Books that treat of the Sciences in an entertaining Manner, such as *Fontenelle's Plurality of Worlds*: in short, whatever is either innocently diverting, or whatever is instructive, and at the same Time so amusing as to fix the Attention of the Hearers. With Regard to History, it will be sufficient to select only the most remarkable and striking Events of that of other Nations. But a greater Part of that of our own Country ought to be known. Herein the Bulk of the Nation is most grossly ignorant: and to this Ignorance is in a great Measure to be ascribed the Ferment that so many Fools are at present raising throughout the Kingdom in Behalf of a despicable Pretender to Patriotism, and the silly Notion of his Rejection from the House of Commons being (to use their favour-

ite Expression) one of the *most alarming Circumstances* that ever happened. Were they to read the English History, they would see how many Circumstances it contains infinitely more *alarming* than the not indulging the ignorant, perverse, and brutishly unmanerly Freeholders of a score of our Counties in their Endeavours to force into the Senate a Man, whose sitting there, considering the Cause for which he was so justly expelled seven Years ago, would, in all Probability, bring upon the British Throne and Administration the Contempt of all *Europe*.

I submit it (as I said before) to all unprejudiced Persons of Understanding, whether the above Method of teaching foreign Languages is not a rational one, and likely to prove far more speedy and efficacious, and at the same Time far less perplexing than what has been hitherto in use. It is to be considered too that, while it teaches *Words*, it likewise teaches *Things*, which is of still much greater Consequence: and Youth instructed in this Manner would be more knowing—considerably so—by fifteen or sixteen Years of Age than nine Persons in ten, even of such an Education as till now has been called *good*, have hitherto been as long as they have lived.

There is one Thing that I forgot to mention, in speaking of teaching French and other foreign Languages. Some Part of the Time ought to be allotted for the Foreigner to deliver twice over the Sentences he reads; once in a slow, distinct Manner; the other in a rapid way,
and

and as fast as any of his Countrymen may ever be supposed to talk. For want of this, according to what I observed of the Boy from the Boarding-School, though the Learner understood the Language ever so well when spoken slowly, he would comprehend but little of the Conversation in the Company of those whose Mother-tongue it was.

The Latin and Greek ought most certainly, as well as the modern Tongues, to be taught by telling the Scholars every Thing. But the Difference, in Regard to Form, of these two Languages from the modern ones requires a more tedious Method.

The Scholars may be divided into three Classes. I should think that Number sufficient. The lowest Class must be told even the minutest Things. I shall take the two first Lines of the *ÆNEID*, to explain myself.

The Master first reads to the Scholars these two Lines.

*Arma Virumque cano, Trojæ qui primus ab Oris
Italiam, Fato profugus, Lavinaque venit
Littora.*

Then he gives the general Sense of them in English. *I sing of Arms, and of the Man, the first who, impell'd by a Decree of Heaven, having left the Coasts of Troy, sail'd to Italy and the Lavinian Shore.* He then construes them Word by Word. *Cano* I sing of, *Arma* Arms, *que* and, *Virum* the Man, *qui* who, *primus* the first, *profugus* being driven, *Fato* by Heaven, or Destiny, *ve-*
nit

nit came, *ab Oris* from the Coasts, *Trojae* of Troy, in *Italiam* to Italy, (the Preposition *IN* is here supposed) *que* and, *Lavina Littora* the Lavinian Shores. Then he tells them what part of Speech each Word is, and what it's Office is, and declines the Nouns and conjugates the Verbs. *Cano* is a Verb active of the third Conjugation. It is the first Person singular of the present Tense of the indicative Mood. *Arma* is a Noun Substantive of the third Declension and of the neuter Gender. It is in the accusative Case of the plural Number. This Word has no singular Number. The nominative Case is *Arma*, the genitive *Armorum*, the dative *Armis*. *Que* is a Conjunction copulative between *Arma* and *Virum*. *Virum* is a Noun Substantive of the second Declension. It is the accusative Case of the singular Number. The Nominative is *Vir*, the Genitive *Viri*, the Dative *Viro*, &c.

In this Manner he explains every Word, and then proceeds to the next Sentence.

I am convinced that Boys instructed thus would learn more (and with some Degree of Pleasure) in one Year than has been hitherto learnt in Misery in three or four: for it may justly be called *Misery* to be everlastingly puzzled; and this is certainly the Case with Boys at a Latin and Greek School. I would gladly know what Spell there is in these two Languages, that we should be set to learn them in a more perplexing Way than other Languages are learnt. Or what is there in the Nature of Language in general, that should make it necessary to teach it in a Manner different from that in which all other Things

Things are taught? viz. By the Teacher's shewing the Learner every, even the minutest, Circumstance, without any more to-do? What Sort of an Army should we have, if Corporals and Serjeants, instead of shewing Recruits their Exercise, should give them mysterious Rules in writing to learn it by? The poor Bumpkins would regret their Day-labour and the 'Trades from which they had run away, as being less Hardships than those confounded Rules, and would run away again, though they knew themselves liable to be shot for so doing. And if Shoemakers were to take the same Method to instruct their 'Prentices, the next Generation would be crippled.

The Master, in teaching the second Class, need not be quite so minute. It would be sufficient to say *such a Word is a Verb neuter of such a Conjugation. It is in such a Tense of such a Mood; without mentioning the Person or Number. Such a Word is a Noun Substantive of such a Declension. It is in the Ablative Case; without going through all the preceding Cases.*

With the third Class, he need only construe, without mentioning the Parts of Speech, which these Scholars must be supposed to know. Indeed, if any uncommon and irregular Word occurs, he may take Notice of it.

Now these Instructions are in Lieu of the Pains that Scholars are used to take by themselves in all Schools, to learn their Lesson.

When the Master has gone through this Lesson,

son, the Scholars sit down and consider it. By and by they are called out again, to construe it, and to do every Thing that the Master did before: And this they certainly will do much better than if they had employed in the endeavouring to unravel it in the Way hitherto in Use, six or seven Times the Time that the Master took to deliver it.

With the lowest Class, with whom the Master is the most circumstantial, eight or ten Lines would be sufficient for a Lesson. With the second, sixteen or eighteen. But with the third Class, where he loses no Time in declining and conjugating, he may go through fifty-five or sixty. And each Class may have two Lessons in a Morning, and two in the Afternoon.

The Task at Night should, I think, be an easy one, that their Learning may not, by costing them too much Pains, become disgustful. For the inferior Scholars, a few of the Grammar Rules every Night; and for the upper ones a few of the same Rules twice a Week, and four Times a Week eight or ten Lines of English turned into Latin. I mean into Prose. The setting Boys to make Latin Verses is one of the greatest of Absurdities. If any Boy has, or thinks he has, a Talent for Poetry, and had rather translate into Verse than into Prose, let him. But, as to the making Poets of those whom Nature has not made so, one might as well attempt to turn Brick and Mortar into Gold.

There is no necessity at all for Boys to
have

have gone through their Grammar, nor through any Part of it, before they begin to read Authors: but they may enter upon both at once. Don't Children understand their Mother-tongue long before they hear of Grammar? The greatest Part of the Nation never hear of it at all. If a Man were with a serious Countenance to ask a Servant-Wench, that is standing at a Door, what a Noun Adjective is, and whether such a Verb governs a Dative or an Accusative Case, she would conclude him to be out of his Senses; and would perhaps run frightened into the House, and tell her Mistress that a Madman was going to do her a Mischief. And yet this Wench, who never heard a Word of Prepositions, Participles, Substantives and Verbs, makes use of all these Parts of Speech (and, generally speaking, very properly) without knowing that they have any Names, as *Moliere's* Gentleman-Cit had talked Prose for forty Years without knowing it: and, if she often talks false English, it is owing not so much to her being unacquainted with Grammar as to the low Company she has kept. Women of polite Education, who are used to good Company, though they have studied Grammar no more than this Servant-maid, talk, if not quite correctly, yet more correctly than such Men in ordinary Life as have passed some Years at a Latin-school.

Such are the Methods, which I have been long convinced ought to be followed, to teach the modern and the dead Languages: and I have the Satisfaction to find that *Mr. Locke* in his
Treatise

Treatise on Education, as sensible a Book as was ever yet written, proposes something not unlike it. I cannot without Indignation think of the Number of Years, that young People pass (as I said before) painfully and to little future Profit, when they might, with some Degree of Pleasure, make a far greater Improvement in far less Time.

Had I the Means of doing it, I would establish,—at least, I *firmly believe* I should do what I am going to say. No Man knows with Certainty how he would act in Circumstances, wherein he has never yet been placed. Many a one, while necessitous, has formed generous Designs, who afterwards, when Fortune has taken him into Favour, has turned out a mere Poltroon. Let me say then, I *most firmly believe* that, had I the Means of doing it, I should establish a large School in every considerable Town in *England* for the teaching Latin and Greek in the Manner here described, and that I should also erect several Theatres in *London* as capacious as that of *Covent-Garden*, but of a more pleasing and convenient Form, for the teaching French and Italian as above; and one in each of our largest Cities or Towns, such as *York*, *Norwich*, *Manchester*, for the same Purpose. In all these Theatres Latin and Greek should be taught likewise; not in the same Way as in the above Schools, where the Master construes the Lessons Word by Word, and afterwards tells the Scholars what

Part

Part of Speech each Word is, and declines the Nouns and conjugates the Verbs; but merely by first reading a Sentence in the dead Language, and then giving the general Sense of it in English. Besides that such Lessons would keep alive and even improve in grown Persons the Knowledge of these two Languages that they had acquired at School, those who had never studied them at all, might in a little Time, and without Trouble, come to understand them so well as to be able to read them with Pleasure, even though they knew nothing of the Rules of Grammar. In order to make these Lessons the more instructive, and that the Hearers might improve in the Knowledge of *Things* as well as of *Words*, I would cause to be translated into *Latin* at least, if not into *Greek*, a certain Number of modern Authors, that treat, in an easy entertaining Way, of the Sciences or of Natural History.

The Expence to the Learners, considering the Capaciousness of these Theatres, and that no more Teachers would be required than in a common School, would be next to nothing. Such as chose it might subscribe by the Year. The others, who came occasionally, might be admitted for a mere Trifle.

It seems probable to *me* that these Theatres would, as soon as Prejudice against them as a Novelty were worn off, be much frequented. 'Tis true that by far the greatest Number of adult People take no Pains to acquire Knowledge.

But

But this is not caused by their Indifference for it. The real Cause is that the Pains of acquiring it are too great. Almost every Body would be glad to know, but almost every Body hates the Trouble of studying : and, if Knowledge could be gain'd with ease and at little or no Expence, scarcely any one would be what we now call *ignorant*, notwithstanding those would still be thought so, who were the least knowing.

He that increases Knowledge, says Solomon, increases Sorrow : And it is very true, that so great a Degree of it as causes an insatiable Desire of acquiring more must make a Man unhappy ; and this possibly was the Case with *him*. But it is not true that every Degree of Knowledge renders a Man, *ceteris paribus*, more unhappy than those who have less. It is with Knowledge as with other Acquirements. An Excess of it raises an uneasy Desire of still adding, as the gaining excessive Riches increases the Passion of Avarice. But a moderate Degree of Knowledge adds to the Pleasure of Life, by furnishing Matter for Conversation.

I am sensible that many half-conceiving People would object to this Scheme, and tell me that, if an Acquaintance with the Sciences and Natural History, and the Knowledge of foreign or of the dead Languages were to become common, we should have a Generation of Pedants, and that the ordinary Business of Life would come to be neglected. But this Objection is ill-grounded. It might indeed often happen that Men would repair to these Places of Instruction, who

would

would otherwise pass their Evening at a Tavern or a Public House : and so much the better for themselves and their Families : it would be less expensive, without any Injury to their Constitution. But there is no Fear that the Generality of Mankind will ever become so studious as to neglect the ordinary and necessary Business of Life. 'Tis on the very Account of the Aversion they have for the Painfulness of Study that this easy Method of Instruction is contrived.

Had Fortune enabled me to put such a Scheme in Execution, and did the Example come to be followed (which I make no doubt it would as fast as Prejudice subsided) and Languages come to be taught in the Manner here recommended, I should think I had done more Good (far more) than any one Man ever did ; for it would be easing Youth in general of much present Perplexity, and laying a Foundation for more Pleasure in the future Part of their Life than they would otherwise enjoy.

How easy a Matter would it be for a Man of an over-grown Fortune to do this ! And yet if any such Man were advised to do it, he would probably think the Adviser mad. But let a favourite Groom come at the same Time and whisper him that there is going to be, at a few Miles Distance, a Race between a Jack-Afs and a Boar, that the Match was made by Sir *William* Such-a-one, and 'Squire Such-a-one, and that the Afs is to give the Boar seven Miles in twelve, he'll be perhaps highly delighted with

the Information, swear 'tis the best *Scheme* he ever heard of, and hurry away to this famous Race, where, for the Novelty of the Thing, he takes the Boar's Part, bets high upon his Head, and is more concern'd for the Honour of this grunting Animal than for the Welfare of all Christendom.

But, though among all the enormously wealthy Subjects your Majesty has, there may not be even one that interests himself enough in the general Happiness to be at some Thousand Pounds Expence to promote it, while many of them would gladly and proudly be at that Expence in Gewgaws for the shewy Reception of a distinguish'd Guest, I don't give up all hope that, if these Lines should ever reach your Majesty, your Opinion may be that these Notions of mine concerning Instruction are rational, and that, in Consequence of that Opinion, and reflecting how much Mankind might possibly be benefited by the Method of teaching here proposed, you may at some convenient Time think proper, by way of Trial, to establish a considerable School upon a something-like Principle with what I have here gone upon. Such Trial, considering the extensively happy Consequences if it should answer, would most certainly be worth making, were there but even the faintest Prospect of its answering.

I make bold to mention, in the third Place, some Thoughts that have occur'd to me in Relation to the Improvement of the Art of Painting

ing among us, for which your Majesty has been pleased lately to erect an Academy.

What Opportunities of Improvement there may be for young Fellows in the Academies in *Italy*, I never learnt: but in that of *Paris* I know of none but their Drawing two Hours every Evening from the living Model. He is exhibited three Evenings together in the same Posture: so that six Hours are allowed for the Drawing each Figure. This, without doubt, is very useful, and will go a great Way towards enabling them to draw in History-Painting with mere Correctness; but there is something wanting to form the Taste. For this the Study of the best antique Statues has been always recommended.

There are in the Academy there about thirty of these Figures in Plaster, cast in Moulds made upon the Originals in *Italy*; and young Painters had formerly (in the Time of *Lewis* the XIVth) the Liberty of drawing from them, but were deprived of it for having done them some Damage.

I have often wondered, considering how much *Lewis* had at Heart the Flourishing of Painting and Sculpture in his Kingdom, that he never caused the best of the Antiques to be drawn and engraved with Care. One *Perrier*, a Frenchman of his Time, did indeed draw and engrave a considerable Number of them. But these Figures of his would contribute but very triflingly towards improving the Taste of any Painter or Sculptor: for, though they are engraved with tolerable

terable Spirit, they are drawn in a very careless Manner, and have little or nothing of the elegant Form of the Originals.

There would be no great Difficulty in finding Draughtsmen, who could imitate with the utmost Precision the Shape of what they had before their Eyes: and, if three or four of these were employed to draw with the greatest Care and Exactness a hundred of the best antique Statues, and their Drawings were to be engraved with the same Exactness, the Possession of these Prints, as they would exhibit perfectly the Form of these Antiques, would answer nearly as well, with Regard to the Improvement of a Man's Taste, as the Possession of the Statues themselves. These hundred Figures might be drawn, one with another, in four different Views (some perhaps in five, some but in three, according to the Attitude) which would make four hundred Prints: and I should imagine it best to make them full twenty Inches long, that every Part might be seen distinctly.

The Expence of this would be trifling to any one of our modern *Cræsus*: & if the Plates were to be made a Present of to our Academy, the Managers of it, instead of Medals, might reward the Students in History-painting and Sculpture with a whole Set of these Prints, half a Set, or a quarter of a Set, according to the Merit of their respective Performances. The Honour would be the same to the young Fellows as what they now acquire by the Gift of Medals, and the

the Study of these Figures would improve them in their Profession.

Such Students as intended to follow any [other Branch of Painting should likewise, if they chose it, be rewarded with these Prints instead of Medals : and the Prints should be sold to any Painter or Sculptor whatsoever at the low Price of Six Guineas for the Set. Other People should pay twice as much. Long before the Plates were worn out, a considerable Sum of Money would be raised ; Part of which might be employed, when Occasion were, for the Drawing and Engraving the same Figures again, and the Rest for whatever the Managers should judge most for the Benefit of the Academy.

To prevent the common Practice there would otherwise be of Painters and Sculptors buying these Prints at the low Price here mentioned and disposing of them to other People, no one should have the Liberty of ever purchasing more than one Set at that Price.

But, to render an Academy for Painting complete, there ought, without Doubt, to be the Means of Improvement in Colouring, as well as in Drawing. How many very rich Men have we who are profest Lovers of Pictures ! and what would it be for fifty of these to contribute Four Hundred Pounds a-piece for the Building a Gallery, and furnishing it with capitally coloured Pictures, for young Fellows, by Permission of the Managers of the Academy, to copy ? Two hundred, consisting of History, Portraits, Landscapes,

scapes, Animals, small Dutch Conversation-pieces, and Still-life, would be enough.

Many People, who imagine no excellent Pictures are to be had but at a very extravagant Price, will suppose Twenty Thousand Pounds not to be sufficient for the building this Gallery and furnishing it with this Number of capitally coloured Pictures. I believe it would be more than sufficient. It would perhaps pay at the the same Time for the Drawings and Engravings from the Antiques, that I have been mentioning: for, though very paltry Pictures (such as a Man of any Judgment would not even *accept of*) are sometimes sold at an exorbitant Price, such as are first-rate in point of Colouring are often to be had for a small Matter. How many admirably colour'd Portraits, Landscapes, and Pieces of Still-life do we see sold at our Auctions under Twenty Guineas; nay, sometimes even for five or six! Now, allowing thirty-five Pounds for one Picture with another, the two Hundred would come to seven Thousand Pounds; and, if half the Money were allotted for twenty-five large History-Pieces, there would be Twenty-Pounds a-piece (which would be more than enough) for the other Hundred and seventy-five.

It might appear strange, if I should recommend Copies, rather than Originals, for these History-pieces. But it is to be considered that the best Originals of *Titian*, *Rubens*, *Vandyke*, and the Rest of the greatest Colorists, are either in Churches, or in the Possession of Princes or of wealthy

wealthy Noblemen, and are not to be had at any Rate; whereas it would be easy to obtain Leave to have them copied. I mean that it would be easy for your Majesty or for the Academy of Painting to obtain it, however difficult or impossible it might be for any single private Person. It is not to be doubted but that, if the King of *France* or the French Academy of Painting should be desirous of a Copy from a Picture in your Majesty's Possession, you would immediately grant Leave to have it taken: and there is as little Doubt that, if your Majesty or the newly erected Academy requested the same Favour of any foreign Prince, it would be granted as readily. I should think it therefore most proper, instead of looking out for Originals, to have twenty-five masterly Copies from the most exquisitely colour'd Pictures of *Titian*, *Rubens*, *Vandyke*, and one or two more of the greatest Colorists. 'Tis an egregious Mistake many pretended Judges of Painting lie under, that Copies are always known for such, and can have no very great Degree of Merit. Even the best Critics are often deceived, and take Copies for Originals. I lodged, in my youth, for a considerable Time, in the House of an old Man in *Paris*, named *Montagne*, who had then in his Possession three Portraits copied from *Vandyke* by his Father, who had been an esteemed History-painter, and was a very masterly Copist; which Pictures had deceived the whole Academy of Painting there, with the celebrated

Le Bran at the Head of them, not one among them all suspecting these Pictures to be Copies.

I had likewise the following Anecdote from some old Painters belonging to that Academy. A History-piece of *Titian's* was once offered to *Lewis* the 14th at the Price of eight Hundred Lewis-d'ors. The King agreed to purchase it, provided the Members of the Academy judged it to be an Original. The Picture was thereupon carried to the Academy. It was acknowledged to be an Original, and the Money was paid. Before it was taken away, a Man of Fortune coming to view the Academy, and casting his Eye upon this Picture, *ha !* said he, *I see here is a Copy from my Picture.*—*A Copy, Sir !* said the Person that was shewing him the Place. *It is an Original, the King has just bought it.*—*No,* replied the Gentleman : *I have the Original.* This was immediately carried to the King, who desired the two Pictures might be compared. The Gentleman's Picture was then sent to the Academy ; and all the Members declared that if either of the two was the real Original, it must be *that*. Thereupon the King desiring to know if the Gentleman was willing to part with his Picture, and the Gentleman consenting, the King ordered eight Hundred Lewis-d'ors to be given him, together with the Picture that he had first purchased.

The Story is well known, that is related by *Vasari*, of a capital Picture of *Raphael's* being copied by *Andrea del Sarte*, and the Copy's afterwards

terwards imposing upon *Julio Romano*, who had himself painted some part of the Original. And it was not upon a superficial View merely that he was deceived; for he resided in the Duke of *Mantua's* Palace, where this Picture was, was a profest Admirer of it, and therefore without Doubt had often considered it with Attention: Nor when *Vasari*, to whom he was shewing it as a Curiosity, informed him that the Picture was a Copy, would he believe it, 'till *Vasari* assured him that he himself had seen it painted by *Andrea del Sarte*, and gave him to understand that a Mark had been put at the Back of it, to prevent it's being mistaken for the Original; which Mark *Julio Romano* found upon turning the Picture.

There is, or was some few Years ago, according to credible Report, a Man at *Paris*, who copied even the best-coloured Pictures, and such as were pencill'd in the most masterly Way, with so great a Freedom and so perfect an Exactness as to deceive any Person whatsoever. He has offered to wager that he would make several Copies from an old Picture of a great Master, paint them in such a Manner as to make them look old, and it should not be discovered which was the Original, when it was placed with his Copies.

That by far the greatest part of those Portraits, which pass for Originals of *Vandyke's*, are in Reality Copies, there can be no Doubt, when it is considered that he died at between forty-two and

forty-three Years of Age. How was it possible for a Man of that Age to have filled all *Europe* with his Pictures? as he has done, if he really painted all that are said to be by his Hand.

In short, there is Nothing more certain than that Copies frequently impose even upon the best Critics; and that many of them are very nearly equal to their Originals: and I don't see why every Prince in *Europe* should not keep some excellent Hand in constant Employ in copying for him the Master-pieces of the greatest Painters. What a Feast for Lovers and Judges of Painting would a large Collection be of masterly Copies, taken from the very Cream of the Works of these Men! It would be superior not only to an equal Number of Originals of second-rate Painters, but even to an equal Number of such Pictures as these greatest Painters themselves produced in common, and would have some Resemblance to a Library, where the Works of the finest Writers in different Languages are brought together. There ought, as I should think, to be such a Collection in every Metropolis, to which Access might always be had upon very easy Terms. It would be an occasional and an innocent Amusement for great Numbers of People, and would conduce not a little to a Refinement of Taste.

I shall trouble your Majesty with no other Proposal for the present, though there are many that I could make, and, among them, one or two of no difficult Execution, and of more Consequence

sequence than that which I have here made in Regard to the teaching Languages: and yet I confess I look upon this as a very important one. These I may possibly one Day or another put into Print. In the mean Time I cannot help pitying your Majesty, if such an Expression may be used from an obscure Man to his Sovereign, in having for Subjects a turbulent, capricious, and unmannerly People: for such the English most certainly are, whatever Merit they may have in other Respects. But indeed your Majesty might not unreasonably have suspected a future Ill-humour in them from the extrayagant, the foolish and groundless Joy they expressed at your Accession to the Throne. I call it *foolish and groundless* for this Reason. We had just lost a good King, a *very* good one. I mean *comparatively* good: for, in Fact, I don't allow any King of any Nation to have done his Duty and to have been what may properly be called *good*. However, your Majesty's Grandfather was undoubtedly a much better and more equitable Sovereign than the greatest Part of those that this or any of the neighbouring Kingdoms have had. He was therefore *comparatively* a very good one. On the other Hand, we knew Nothing at that Time of your Majesty's Disposition. You might prove a better King, and you might prove a worse. But, as the deceased King had been a much better than most of those that had preceded him, the Chance was against us, and it was most probable that your Majesty would
not

not prove so good a one as he. Upon this Account, I say, I call the extravagant Joy, that appeared at your Majesty's Accession, *foolish and groundless*; and it most certainly was so. But this is the Temper of the greatest Part of Mankind, and of no Nation more than of the English. We are ever dissatisfied with the present state of Things. and, without any just Ground, take it for granted that an Alteration will be greatly for the better. In short, we suppose every King at his Accession to be an Angel; and, soon finding him not to be one, we imbibe a contrary Prejudice, and think him a worse Man than he really is. The same Absurdity prevails in Respect to Ministers. A fresh Set is always (we foolishly hope) to rectify every Thing that is amiss. We find in a little Time that they have not done it, and thereupon, without making Allowances for the Difficulty of the Task or for the Passions common to all Men, look upon them as one of the worst Sets the Nation ever had. *The Nation is undone* has been the Cry for as long as I can remember; and I am now in the Decline of Life. It was the same in the Childhood of my Father before me, and, I make no Doubt, in that of his Great-Grandfather before *him*. The present Age is always an Age of Lead or of Iron. This Inclination to Discontent has ever made Anti-courtiers the Darlings of the People. Wretches of no Principle, vile Incendiaries, for whom the Whipping-post and the Gallows would have been too mild a Punishment

ment, have been adored and looked upon as the Support and Prop of the Nation, on no other Account than their grossly abusing the Government, and doing all in their Power to distress it. No honest Man of tolerable Understanding can read the several Volumes of our Parliamentary Debates, without being fired with Indignation at the unreasonable and petulant Opposition the Minister has often met with, even in Matters of the greatest Indifference. Among other Anticourtiers, Sir *William W——m* (undeniably a Man of Parts) made many an ingenious Speech, for which a *criminal Court of Equity*, had there been such a Thing, would have hang'd him, a Punishment more than merited by some Hundreds of our present Patriots.

Yet at the same Time that I am convinced these pretended Patriots have in general little Ground for their violent Clamours, and especially that Nothing can be more senseless than their Notion that the Non-reception of a certain Man of weak Intellects, and to all Appearance of most infinite Vanity, into the House of Commons is a dangerous Precedent in Regard to the Freedom of Elections, at the same Time, I say, it would favour too much of Adulation, were I to affirm or to intimate that I believe all the Measures taken since your Majesty's Accession to be just. In particular, I am heartily concern'd as well that your Majesty should have been prevailed upon to pardon the two Criminals, *Mac Quirk* and *Balf*, as for the Subject of Complaint of the
Americans,

Americans. How far this last Circumstance may be justified by our Laws is, as I should conceive, less to be considered than how far it is political, or how far agreeable to the Laws of Humanity. It would be a high Absurdity to suppose that so immense a Country will always continue in Subjection to such a Spot as *England*. Our Americans will one Day form a vast independent Empire, or Empires. But, the more indulgently they are till then treated, the more remote, in all Probability, will that Period be.

For what remains, should I live to find that your Majesty has thought the above Proposals of mine worth attending to, and particularly that concerning the teaching Languages, which I cannot help considering as a Matter of Consequence, it will be an Addition to the Happiness of the remaining Part of my Days.

I am, with with my sincere Wishes, that your Majesty may see infernal Faction speedily quell'd, and that your Life may be long and happy, and your Reign such as Posterity shall approve,

Your Majesty's very obedient

Servant and Subject,

The Author of the ensuing Remarks.





